

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLIV No. 9 SEPTEMBER 1959

ENGLISH SPIRITUAL WRITERS

IX. ROBERT STEUART, S.J.

WE are often told, when studying a work of art, to pay no attention to what we know of the artist, but to consider the statue, the opera, or book in a totally detached way. Certainly, at school, I was impressed and "altered" by e.g. "Rabbi Ben Ezra", "The Grammarian's Funeral", "Pictor Ignotus" without knowing or caring in the least about Browning; but now I should always want to know about a poet, either before approaching his poem, or at least by means of it, and as for Fr Steuart, his doctrine seems to me inextricably interwoven with his developing character. For he consistently taught that God calls all men to "perfection", i.e. to close union with Himself, and this doctrine seems to me incarnate in his resistance, intermittent response, and finally wholehearted yielding to a continuous Vocation. He dealt explicitly with Vocation in his *Diversity in Holiness* (1936) where he wrote of outstanding personages, like St Catherine of Genoa, the Curé d'Ars, St Ignatius Loyola, who followed their vocation against obstacles initial or enduring, exterior or interior, and also less-known names, like Eustelle Harpain or the Abbé Huvelin. I think he muffled up his "cases" in too much general ascetic commentary and could have strengthened his argument by more sheerly historic detail; but his point is always the same—God calls everyone to Himself, but by paths as different as are different temperaments, and followed maybe hesitatingly, stumblingly, even restively. If St Paul was described as "kicking against the goad", that could not imply just one single kick.

Robert Steuart, then, was born on 13 April 1874, at Reigate in Surrey, two years before his parents moved to the early nineteenth-century house of Ballechin (the sixteenth-century house had been demolished).¹ His boyhood was full of sacer-

¹ Fr Steuart enjoyed the number 13. Born on a 13th, his name counted 13 letters; he went to prepare for the Navy when 13; passed 13th into Woolwich, 1891; went to the Jesuit noviciate on 13 February 1893; was army chaplain from

dotal dreams and ascetic practices till all this "vanished" before a "sudden desire" to join the Navy: in 1887 he went to a crammer's, but was lazy and failed in his first examination: his indignant father said he must join the Army and sent him to an extremely harsh crammer; here he had "odd intervals" of devotion and "vague thoughts" of becoming a Jesuit, but would take mathematical books to study during Mass till one day he "made a vow" that if he passed into Woolwich (he hated the idea) he would, after a year, leave and join the Society. He did pass, earned a reputation for rowdiness, nor were his expeditions to London edifying. Failing at a terminal examination, and cut to the heart by his father's saying: "You fool!", he told his brother Bernard: "I'll go and be a Jesuit" rather as a man might say: "I'll blow my brains out!" Looking for a book in the dark, he hit upon the *Life of St Stanislaus*: that, he saw, was his vocation. Inexplicable, but definitive decision. He spent weekends at Farm Street to re-learn Latin, and was given the very room in which he was to spend his last years, and suffer his death-stroke. How often he had said to me: "And I'm no better now than then." So may a man misjudge himself.

On 13 February 1893, then, he began his two years' novitiate: I do not think he would have survived them without a real vocation and indeed the sense of it. The change from a semi-feudal atmosphere and "dialect", from Zola to Rodriguez, was certainly abrupt, but he *meant* the break to be absolute, yet did not realize that in two highly idealistic years this could not happen, especially as he could not but feel that his actual training was very prosaic.

Two years of "juniorate" followed the novitiate of which some restrictions were removed. At once he felt his "individuality" revive; his versatility won him, said he, "no friends", but (I was afterwards told) not a few "worshippers"; later still, I know how vigorously he resisted the formation of a "circle" of devotees, inevitable as it became. But he was still unstable and his career was inconsecutive. After one year's philosophy (instead of three) he was sent to Oxford for mathematics but

¹³ October 1916 till 13 November 1919; the number of his hospital room at Linz and of his berth when returning home, gassed, was 13; he became superior at Oxford, 13 December 1921.

became expert in Dickens and Thackeray and got only a third in Moderations: he was then sent to teach at Beaumont, then Wimbledon, then Mount St Mary's, Derbyshire. He felt acutely that these migrations reflected his instability and even "laxity" —in fact, at Wimbledon he was actually warned that he might be dismissed if he could not better adapt himself to his chosen life. He reproached himself the more bitterly because he increasingly felt sure of his vocation to sanctity and specifically to the priesthood; the upshot showed this was no illusion, but that a man may be very slow in becoming what he was really meant to be, and that "contraries" may long co-exist in one and the self-same man.

In 1903 he went to the French house of St-Louis in Jersey to finish his philosophy, and it was here that he experienced a deepening of his religion that was to endure and increase. It was, a sense of the transcendence of God; and thus, of the inability of the human intellect to know Him otherwise than "analogically" (he was unaffected by later attacks on the very idea of "analogy"). It would be difficult to exhibit any complete or orderly "map" of the way in which Fr Steuart's teaching kept referring back to this fundamental truth. He wrote no one book on any single theme; he carefully composed conferences and kept the manuscripts, and when he had enough he put them in a sufficiently logical order and published them only then as a book. Anyhow, since he was ordained in 1907 (not having done very well in "theology") he certainly took his time, for his first book, *The Inward Vision*, appeared only in 1929.

In the very first chapter of this book, *Deus Absconditus*, he made it quite clear in what sense God is "unknowable", while how true (but analogically so) is what we can say of His existence and nature. He never played false to this, but certainly leaned heavily towards the stripping of the mind of as much anthropomorphism as is possible: he loved to quote: "I will not have my thoughts instead of Thee": he shared St John of the Cross's hostility to "images", though I cannot find that he knew the poem *Entréme donde no supe*: "I entered where I knew not", with its refrain: *Toda ciencia trasciendo*. He would have been as horrified of the doctrine of "two truths", of faith and science, independent of one another, as St Thomas was, but at

first, no doubt, he might use indefensible phrases such as: "Our most philosophical and theological ideas of (God) are *absurd deformations* (italics mine) in comparison with the truth about Him." Those who saw only his self-possessed, courteous demeanour will hardly have guessed the vehemence, even violence, of his feelings, the *intensity* of his interior life: when talking with people who he knew—or thought—would "take him the right way", he might use wild exaggerations, often very amusing, sometimes sardonic; but he tried, in his books, always to dwell upon ideas and to eschew all rhetorical "colouring". His mind, once so avid for experiences, began to glide away from the "transitory and accidental": and his *Four First Things*, written early in the Second World War, contained, said the *Expository Times*, nothing "topical", but might have been written "in any year of our modern age". Consciously, too, he tried to divest himself of the dialect or turns of thought proper to what used to be called "the Garden of the Soul" tradition which had been exclusively that of his upbringing. To one who sincerely praised its sturdy virtues, he said: "No. That is *not* for us or for our generation. All that is dead and done with."¹

Such a sentence forces me to insist that he never wavered—not only, of course, in matters of doctrine, but in his adherence to the essence of that scholastic theology of which he knew more than many thought. And soon enough the second focus of his mind became the Presence of God in all creation and especially in each one's soul, herein recalling St Teresa, to whom it came almost as a revelation that she could pray to God within her. But whether he wished our life, and his own, to be "theocentric" by means of abdicating "ego-centricty" so far as possible or by finding God in all created things or events, he would have been appalled had he been taken as wishing to be other than a "Christo-centric" man. He once wrote that he was "obsessed" by Christ. Yet he did not chiefly mean, dare I say, the Palestinian Christ but Christ alive as He now is, following (not quite unconsciously) the Saints who often tell us to transcend even the Sacred Humanity, and St Paul himself (II Cor. v, 16). Thus he wished to see Christ in that Body of His "which is the Church" and alive therefore in every member of it. I can even

¹ May I refer to *The Two Voices; with a Mémoir of Fr Steuart*, (1952), p. 63.

risk saying that he might not have minded much if Bethlehem, Nazareth, Jerusalem were bombed into dust—that would have made no difference to the indestructible Christ—while I, though wishing, as he, “no more to know anyone merely according to the flesh”, would like *also* to see every flower or rock and study the contours of every hill that our Lord Himself saw. They are the hem of His garment and we too are allowed to take hold of it, while being ready to be told, like Magdalen in the garden of Resurrection, not to cling to Him. But lest this should suggest that Fr Steuart’s doctrine of the Church fell short in regard of its visible and institutional nature, nowhere can this be more uncompromisingly stated than e.g. in chapters 3 and 4 of his *In Divers Manners*. But he could not say everything at once; and no one will deny that until lately it has been the “notes” of the visible Church that have been more attended to than the doctrine of Christ’s mystical Body.

No wonder, then, that non-Catholic reviewers felt baffled, and might describe Fr Steuart now as an agnostic, now as a pantheist; as “practically an old-fashioned Methodist”, or, “the Roman apologist in full armour”: as providing “nebulous musings” on Catholic dogma though “of course perfectly orthodox”: as writing “an able discussion of the way to God, acute and *even* broad-minded”, and saying that “it is good to have the Roman point of view put so clearly and *even* fairly” (italics mine). If he insists on our need of using our will more than we do (he was always urging himself to do this), an Anglican review could say that he savoured of “semi-Pelagianism”, though elsewhere (and more emphatically) he so dwells on God’s torrential love for man that our foolish attempts at choosing wrong may seem simply swept away as “no-deed”, to use Dame Julian’s expression. On its side, the *St Martin’s Review* (March 1939) said that his *In Divers Manners* contained, indeed, talk of the “love of the brethren”, but “no practical application, and bewildered men of today are seeking for guidance as to what is God’s will on earth”. Here a point has been made. Fr Steuart was glad to help, if he could, persons or groups engaged in practical good works, but even here, his wish was always to lead them to “pray better”.

I think he hardly, if ever, mentioned those very exalted

states of prayer we associate with the great mystics; in fact there were those who reproached him for not doing so in his *Map of Prayer* (1926); but he probably thought these critics were "drawing-room mystics", with whom he had no patience. But while he would have held that "given" prayer was better than "made" prayer, he would not have denied that a measure of "discursive" prayer was normal and necessary; he expected it would lead at least to that "prayer of simple regard" which was what St Ignatius hoped the preliminary method prescribed in his *Exercises* would lead even beginners. Not that Fr Steuart at all liked the dissection of prayer into various levels; it would lead to overmuch self-consciousness and easily to artificiality. But he never failed to teach that total abdication, "mortification", of the *selfish-self* essential for all who seek true sanctification.

Since this is not primarily a description of Fr Steuart's character, I may briefly say that he seldom enjoyed "consolations" in prayer, and during his last few years maybe not at all. This may have been due partly to natural causes, but also, I cannot doubt, to God's progressive purification of his soul. The "texts" on which he supported his waning vitality were: "My just man shall live by faith", and, "The Lord is my Shepherd". He had to renounce even the ideals he had pictured for *himself*. The days of severe self-inflicted penances were over: so were the long hours of prayer, whether before the altar or in that room where long ago he had come for his pre-novitiate instruction and where now his life was ending. Do what he would, he could not rid himself of the haunting fear of a long-drawn old age or even of the act of dying. Late on 26 June 1948 I went to see him and found him tormented by such thoughts. I said he would not die like that, but suddenly. Next day, in fact, on rising, he had the stroke from which he never recovered a full consciousness. On 9 July he died. R.I.P.

I find it, then, difficult to define why it was said that he provided what countless non-Catholics were "starving for", and what still far more Catholics were "aching for". We have seen how few were the structural themes of his teaching—the Transcendence and the Immanence of God; His self-revelation in Jesus Christ with whom we are called to be incorporate, forming thus His mystical Body, the Church. He wished to help as many

as possible to "appropriate" these tremendous truths with an intensity of which they had not thought themselves capable because they had not normally been invited to do so: he made his own invitation, so to say, simply by setting those facts forward stripped of all technical or pietistic formulas, but with a maximum of conviction. Such, I think, was his own life, in which the realism was apparent but the idealism veiled. Many could hardly believe that it was he who wrote the war-book, *March, Kind Comrade*, because it seemed to them merely a diary written in good English, devoid not only of passion but even of emotion. His days were spent in tedious "slogging" at interviews, correspondence, drafting and correcting his own conferences or sermons, for he did nothing "fluently". Still, throughout he was conscious of being called—*he*, with his talents and limitations alike—and assisted by the indwelling Spirit of God whom he constantly invoked.

C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

THE REVIVED ST JOHN CHRYSOSTOM SOCIETY

ON Tuesday, 21 April, at 4.30 p.m., the surviving committee members of the St John Chrysostom Society met at 43 Palace Street, S.W.1, and discussed plans for a revival of the Society's activities. It was the first committee meeting since the death of our founder and chairman, Archbishop Edward Myers, on 13 September 1956, and it took place almost exactly a third of a century from the Society's date of foundation in 1926. Some mention here of the Society's first beginnings, growth, and progress may not be out of place, since nothing in the way of a connected history of the institution has so far appeared.

At the time of the foundation in 1926 I was on the staff of St Edmund's College, and, though I had then no official connexion with the new Society, I heard a good deal about its early days from our President, Canon Myers (as he then was), who knew that I was deeply interested in the Christian East. The

chief event of the first year was undoubtedly the Eastern Liturgical Week which was celebrated at Westminster in the last days of October 1926. In all, five days were devoted to the celebration, of which full reports appeared in the Catholic Press. The *Tablet* for 16 October of that year carried a large advertisement of the Society's proposed activities (p. 509). On the first evening (Tuesday, 26 October) His Eminence Cardinal Bourne took the chair, and pointed to the significance of the Liturgy to be offered according to the Slavonic rite, during which the altar would be screened from view behind the *ikonostasis*, the language used would be "beyond the comprehension of those who hear this Mass", and the chant would be "of a character unknown in our churches". Yet, the Cardinal continued: "It is the Truth and the Mass which matter, and here is a true Mass celebrated by a priest who, in communion with the Holy See, accepts the whole faith of Jesus Christ" (*Tablet*, 30 October, p. 586). Canon Myers spoke on the aims of the Chrysostom Society, which, as he explained, was "a studious rather than a contentious body". And the speech of the evening was delivered by Mgr M. d'Herbigny, s.j., Bishop of Ilium, who spoke for three-quarters of an hour on the Oriental Institute in Rome, and on his own recent visit to Soviet Russia.¹

On the days following the opening meeting a number of papers were read by speakers with special knowledge of the Christian East and its liturgies. On Wednesday, 27 October, there were papers by Mr Herbert Ward on "The Church in Iraq", and by Count George Bennigsen, one of the Society's most valued friends and advisers, on "Ikons". On Thursday, the 28th, Dom Lambert Beauduin of Amay addressed the "Semainiers" (as the *Tablet* styled them) on "The Call of the Christian East: Monastic Hopes" and was followed by Miss Gertrude Robinson speaking on "Greek Monasticism". The week of studies was brought to a close on Friday, 29 October, with a paper by Prince Volkonsky on "Russian Music", and by Dom Benedict Morrison's essay in preparation for the solemn rites of the final day, on "The Byzantine Liturgy".

Saturday, 30 October, marked the climax of the Eastern Liturgical Week. A solemn Slavonic Liturgy was celebrated in

¹ For a short notice of Mgr d'Herbigny, cf. *Catholicisme*, Vol. V, column 633.

Westminster Cathedral by Fr Vladimir Abrikosoff, an exiled Russian priest, in the presence of Cardinal Bourne and Bishop d'Herbigny. The *Tablet's* reporter describes the large crowd that filled the Cathedral for the two-hour service. The *ikonostasis* had been set back well towards the altar, and in the space in front of the screen "a throne had been prepared for the Cardinal-Archbishop, who stood, like his flock, throughout the long service". The Cathedral Choir, conducted by Fr Lancelot Long, was wonderfully successful in rendering harmonies in a language not familiar to its members, and Rachmaninoff's music, interspersed with many ritual chants, filled up almost the whole of the two hours (*Tablet*, 6 November 1926, pp. 610-11).

This great Eastern Liturgical week remains up to the present time the Society's most outstanding success. In the years that followed some Liturgies were celebrated and a number of lectures given, but, on the whole, the Society's work was done in a quiet and unobtrusive way. At the time when I became Honorary Secretary (and also treasurer for the time being), in October 1929, the number of members stood at about one hundred and fifty, and the various functions were reasonably well attended. I can recall a series on the Lesser Eastern Churches which created some interest. I myself was responsible for talks on the Maronite Church of Syria and on the Ethiopic bodies, Catholic and Monophysite; Mr Donald Attwater spoke on the Armenian Church, and we were so fortunate as to be able to invite a distinguished Coptic Catholic, Sesostris Sidarous Pasha, to speak to us about the Monophysite and Catholic Copts. At one of our lectures we had a visit from a bishop of Eastern rite, the late Mgr P. F. Bucys, Apostolic visitor to all Catholic Russians in Europe, who had recently been consecrated in Rome for that office.

Apart from lectures and much correspondence about Eastern matters one of the Society's main preoccupations was to supply funds for helping Eastern Catholics. At the time when I became acting treasurer we had nearly £200 in the bank, and on the advice of my predecessor, the late Major Alec Waley, we decided to make various grants in aid. One of our beneficiaries was a small magazine, the *Christianin*, which then did something to keep the lamp of the faith burning on the Polish-Russian

border. At another time the Society started a fund to be used in paying for an Orthodox theological student to take a course at the Catholic faculty in Strasbourg. At all times throughout the decade, from 1929 until the outbreak of war in September 1939, we could have used many times the sums at our disposal, but we were frequently assured that even the little we could give was valuable. In all these matters we had always at our service the splendid example and wise counsel of Count and Countess Bennigen. (The latter died in 1947. R.I.P.)

I ceased to be secretary in 1932, and in 1933 I was elected Vice-Chairman. My place as secretary was taken by my old friend Fr Richard Gay of the Brentwood diocese, who was joined a little later by Mr Clive F. St George, C.B.E., the Clerk to the Journals in the House of Lords. Between them these two were able to do an immense amount for the progress and life of the Society. I remember among many other things one or two delightfully illustrated lectures by Mr St George on his own collection of Russian ikons, and two liturgies celebrated respectively in January 1937 and January 1938, one at Lincoln's Inn (SS. Anselm and Cecilia), and the other at St Patrick's, Soho. For the first we had the kind help of Frs Ryder and Wilcock, s.j., and for the second that of Père Bourgeois, s.j. I can recall very well one of the last committee meetings before the coming of war. It took place at the late Mr H. Codrington's flat in Oakwood Court, and was one of the best attended and most helpful committees ever held. There seemed to be every prospect at that date of a continued growth and development.

Alas, war came all too soon, and at a committee held in December 1939 it was decided that we should have to close down our activities for the duration. I have often wondered since whether we could not have maintained something in the nature of a skeleton service, but it seems certain that we could not have held many rallies or other meetings in 1940 or 1941. At any rate, the decision had been taken, and, when peace came in 1945, it proved unexpectedly difficult to make a fresh start, though some rather tentative meetings were held.

It should be mentioned here that many of the Society's foundation members and excellent friends are no longer with

us. Among these were the late Mrs Charlotte Leigh-Smith, who acted as secretary for some time in the first years; Mrs Charlotte Baynes, O.B.E., for some years our treasurer; Mr H. Norman, C.B.; Mr Tatton and the Hon Mrs Tatton Bower, and Fr Charles Cosby Oakes, who, while he was still a layman, was treasurer for a year or two. Among those who survive special praise should be given to Dom Bede Winslow, O.S.B., of Ramsgate, whose admirable *Eastern Churches Quarterly* has been edited by him for some thirty years, and is always a great stimulus to study and prayer on behalf of the Eastern Churches.

As it has been quite a long time since the four chief objects of our Society were laid before the public, they may be given here with a few words of comment on each of them.

(1) *To work and pray that all men, and in particular the separated Christians of the Near and Middle East, may speedily be united in the One Church of Christ.*

This first object is on the lines of our motto *Ut Unum Sint*, and suggests that, in addition to prayer, the most should be made of all chances of contact with any Eastern clergy or laymen who are not in union with Rome. My experience is that such contacts are usually quite easy to establish, and may do a great deal of good. Among my own acquaintances I used to number, years ago in Jerusalem, the late Mgr Vassilios, Archbishop of Ascalon, a member of the Orthodox Patriarch's synod and chief ecclesiastical judge of the Jerusalem tribunal. I came to know him through some friends among the Orthodox in Jerusalem, and we met on many occasions. We made several expeditions together to the Jordan, 'Ain-Karim and other holy places, and I visited his suite of rooms in the Convent of Abraham near the Holy Sepulchre Church, where we used to discuss many points of mutual interest. Afterwards this good bishop told his friends that, as a result of our friendship, his opinion of the Catholic Church had altered wholly for the better. Up to then, I believe I am right in saying, he had never seen a Catholic priest except at a distance, and this in the Christian East often means at a very great distance. No doubt many visitors to the East will have had similar experiences.

(2) *To foster interest in all works approved by the Holy See that make for a better understanding of the problems of Eastern Christendom.*

Among the many works of this kind may be mentioned the *Catholica Unio*, which serves as a link between various bodies in the countries of Western Europe. Details of the work envisaged by the *Unio* were given in a decree of the Sacred Congregation *pro Ecclesia Orientali* bearing date of the Epiphany, 1931, and signed by the then secretary, the late Cardinal Sincero.¹ The principal aim of the *Unio* as expressed in the decree is to foster in every possible way vocations to the priesthood among the inhabitants of Eastern lands. The first of the statutes for the *Unio* declares:

Pia Societas Catholica Unio eo praesertim ac peculiariter tendit ut cleri indigenae orientalis, cuiuscumque ritus, rectam institutionem adjuvet ad efficacius adlaborandum pro reditu dissidentium ad unitatem Ecclesiae.

Among the means suggested is the erection of seminaries throughout the lands that are largely of Eastern rite, and the provision of burses for educating the students. Before the war this Society had already been established in Switzerland, Bavaria, Belgium and Holland. A proposal was made from an influential quarter that the Society of St John Chrysostom should, while keeping its own style and direction, rank as the recognized branch of the *Catholica Unio* in the British Isles. So far this recommendation has not been put into effect, but the time may well come when the plan may be realized.

(3) *To study and make better known the history and significance of the great Eastern liturgies.*

Long before the Society's foundation in 1926 there had been, it will be remembered by many older readers, a celebration of the Byzantine Liturgy in Westminster Cathedral on Saturday, 12 September 1908, as part of the solemn functions

¹ Cf. *A.A.S.*, vol. xxiii (1931), pp. 162 ff. In spite of its importance this document is not reproduced in the first volume of Fr T. Bouscaren's *Canon Law Digest*.

that gave splendour to the nineteenth Eucharistic Congress. The rite was described in reasonably full outline in the official *Report of the Nineteenth Eucharistic Congress, held at Westminster* (Sands, 1909), at pp. 449–51. The celebrant was the Archimandrite Arsenius 'Atiyeh from the church of St Julien le Pauvre in Paris, and we are told that Dr Adrian Fortescue "superintended the arrangements in all their details".¹ It does not appear probable that Eastern liturgies were often celebrated here between 1908 and 1926. With the foundation of the Society these highlights in the liturgical year became more common, but it was not until after the war that bodies of Eastern priests in union with Rome were permanently established in this country. For those who live in London it is now possible to assist at an Eastern liturgy on almost any day of the year, either at the Marian Fathers' church in Holden Avenue, N.12, or at the Ukrainian church, 143 Saffron Hill, E.C.1.

(4) *To prepare the way for a fuller appreciation of the religious problems of Islam.* [N.B. At the General Meeting of 10 June 1959, this fourth item was deleted from the list of aims.]

It may be thought that this fourth object of the Society was rather in the nature of an afterthought. It must, at any rate, be plain that the problems of Eastern Christians and those of Islam are very different, and that relatively few Westerners are qualified to handle both sets of problems. In fact, it must be frankly admitted that the Society has not, so far, devoted much attention to this fourth object of its existence. What is certain is that it will always strive to approach the problems of Islam, intricate as they are, with sympathy and discernment. An instructive comparison might well be made between the two works on *Mohammedanism* in the "Home University Library". The first of these booklets was a *parergon* of that supreme orientalist, the late Professor D. S. Margoliouth, "a man of most massive learning and great ingenuity", as Dr Gilbert

¹ At the blessing of Dr Fortescue's new church at Letchworth on 6 September 1908, the Latin High Mass was followed by a Byzantine liturgy celebrated by the Archimandrite 'Atiyeh at which Dr Fortescue sang the responses. Cf. *Adrian Fortescue: A Memoir*, by J. G. Vance and J. W. Fortescue (London, Burns Oates, 1924), p. 53.

Murray styles him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1931-1940 (at p. 599). Like most of his works on Islamic subjects this volume had "a mixed reception among orientalists" and its "ironic tone sometimes infuriated his Moslem readers" (op. cit., at p. 598). It appeared in 1911, and was later replaced, in 1949, by a similar work of Margoliouth's successor in the Laudian chair of Arabic at Oxford, Sir Hamilton Gibb, who contrived to combine accuracy and charm of writing with the greatest care to avoid giving offence to Moslems.

What then, at the moment, are the prospects of the Society, thirty-three years after its foundation? The members of our committee are entirely agreed that the prospects are good. It is true that the funds under our control remain small, and that we are unlikely, for the present at least, to be able to assist the Eastern bodies with large grants. We can, however, continue to study the Eastern rites with renewed energy, and from this point of view, the presence in this country of Catholic Churches of Eastern rite is an incentive, as well as being an introduction to many things that can hardly be learnt from books alone.¹ One may also be encouraged by the publication in recent times of books on Eastern rites that were certainly not available in the year 1926. Among these should be mentioned with special thankfulness the two-volume work edited by Mr Archdale King and entitled *The Rites of Eastern Christendom*.² Here one finds a long introductory chapter on the Oriental Rite, followed by detailed descriptions with abundant quotations, of the nine principal rites (Syrian *ritus puri*, Maronite, Syro-Malankarese, Coptic, Ethiopic, Byzantine with variants, Chaldean, Syro-Malabar, and Armenian). The book does not take the place of the still indispensable *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I, by F. E. Brightman, which gives the original Greek where it exists, in addition to translations of rites in other languages. But "Brightman" is now in its sixty-third year, and difficult to find, and is largely useless to those who have no Greek. In his book

¹ There is a story believed to be true of certain medievalists who, some years ago, designed a statue of a fourteenth-century prelate in which he was shown with a cope worn over a chasuble. That story must have been in the minds of some of us, when we were studying, let us say, the Ethiopic rite, without the help of any resident Ethiopic clergy to clear up doubtful points.

² Catholic Book Agency (1947-8). Pp. 676 and 678. Price about £3.

Mr King does for the Eastern rites what he has since done for the *Liturgies of the Religious Orders*, the *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees*, and, most recently, *The Liturgy of the Roman Church*.

We still need a work in English that will give a synoptic view of the Eastern liturgies, and it is to be hoped that we may have some day an English version of Père M. Hanssens, s.j.: *De Missa Rituum Orientalium* [being Volumes II and III of *Institutiones Liturgicae de Ritibus Orientalibus* (Rome, 1930 and 1932)]. As introductory works there are the two volumes by Mr Donald Attwater on *The Christian Churches of the East* (Bruce Co., Milwaukee, revised edition, 1947-48), the latest (4th) edition of Père R. Janin, A.A., *Les Églises Orientales et les Rites Orientaux* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1955) and the still obtainable *Introduction to the Study of Eastern Liturgies* by Père S. Salaville, A.A. (Sands, 1938). By a careful reading of such works we may be led to appreciate the words of St Pius X, in his letter promulgating the fifteenth centenary celebration of our patron, St John Chrysostom: "May the Easterns separated from Us see and understand in what great and profound regard We hold all the rites alike."¹

JOHN M. T. BARTON

EVOLUTION: A PRACTICAL APPROACH

EVOLUTION TODAY

IN THE Encyclical *Humani Generis* of 12 August 1950 on "False Trends in Modern Teaching", the late Pope Pius XII made special mention of the Theory of Evolution. In doing so he made history, for it was the first time that a biological theory had been mentioned by name in an official papal document. He referred to the misuse that had been made of it by

¹ Letter of 22 July 1907, quoted by Salaville, op. cit., pp. 54-5. At the large and representative General Meeting of 10 June 1959, plans were made for many future activities, and a full committee was elected, of which the officers are: Chairman: Right Rev. Mgr John Barton, D.D.; Vice-Chairman: Rev. Prebendary Ronald Pilkington, D.C.L.; Joint Hon. Secretaries: Rev. Ceslaus Sipovich, D.D., of Marian House, Holden Avenue, N.12, and Miss Katherine Hunter-Blair, of 18, Carlisle Mansions, S.W.1.

those who "contend that the theory . . . applies to the origin of all things whatsoever", and "boldly give rein to monistic and pantheistic speculations which represent the whole universe as left at the mercy of a continual process of evolution". The Communists in particular, he said, welcomed these ideas as "a powerful weapon for defending and popularizing their system of dialectical materialism; the whole idea of God is thus to be eradicated from men's minds".

The fact that the Holy Father judged it necessary to deal with this theory in an Encyclical Letter is already sufficient indication of the importance of the Theory of Evolution in our day. In 1958 the celebration of the centenary of the Darwinian Theory amply confirmed his judgement so far as this country is concerned. This again was a unique event. We are well accustomed to celebrate the centenaries of great men, of institutions and even of buildings; the centenary of a scientific theory is something new. The celebration took the form of bringing the theory to the notice of as wide an audience as possible. There were books on Evolution for the general reader, articles in the popular newspapers and magazines, programmes on radio and television (including even the Children's Hour). For months on end Darwin and evolution were news, and by the standards of modern journalism that is a very long time indeed.

Two things especially emerged from all this. The first was the complete assurance of the learned scientists who wrote or spoke on the subject of evolution. None of them betrayed the slightest doubt or hesitation with regard to the theory; the keynote was given by Sir Gavin de Beer in a broadcast address: "We no longer speak of the theory but of the fact of evolution. . . . The evidence leads unequivocally to evolution by natural selection." Moreover, it became clear that with regard to evolution we are faced with a new situation, very different from that which existed twenty or thirty years ago. Evolution is no longer merely an abstruse theory discussed among scientists, philosophers and theologians, studied by the few amateurs who happen to take an interest in such things, but of no importance to the ordinary man. It has been brought, with a wealth of persuasive argument and illustration, to everyone, child or

adult, who reads, listens to the wireless, or watches television. We can take it for granted, I think, that millions will have accepted the statement of the scientists that evolution is no longer a theory, but a fact, and in consequence it is part of the ordinary man's way of thinking.

THE CATHOLIC DILEMMA

Evolution has always been something of a problem for Catholics, and in the present situation it will be a bigger and especially a more immediate problem than ever. On the one hand there is the dogmatic assurance of the scientists, and the ready acceptance of evolution on the part of most people, so that one who rejects it obliges himself to think differently from the majority, and exposes himself to the jibe of being "positively mediaeval", of deliberately ignoring the progress of science and closing his eyes to the enlightenment of the twentieth century. On the other hand there is the uneasy feeling that the Church disapproves of evolution, even though she may not have explicitly condemned it. They often have the idea that evolution is incompatible with their faith, or indeed with religion in general, and the history of the theory certainly appears to give some grounds for such an idea. Already in Darwin's day the supporters of his theory clashed with the Established Church, and evolutionists still refer, not without relish, to the encounter between Bishop Wilberforce and Thomas Huxley, in which they claim Huxley had much the better of the argument and made His Lordship look very small indeed. Many evolutionists have been atheists or agnostics of one kind or another, and we have already quoted Pope Pius XII on the use the Communists make of the theory today in their anti-God campaign.

For Catholic scientists, and biologists in particular, the position is specially difficult. As one writer expressed it recently, "Any biologist who speaks against it is committing suicide". In any case, many Catholic biologists are quite convinced of the truth of evolution; one of them wrote in a recent book: "To be perfectly frank, a biologist in possession of the data now available has no right, practically speaking, *not* to be an evolutionist,

as long as he remains unable to explain the facts in any other way." Not all Catholics accept it so easily, and anyone who seeks to ascertain the Catholic viewpoint on this question is met with a perplexing conflict of opinion. It is not so long since a leading Catholic apologist, reviewing a book on the Piltdown hoax, expressed himself strongly, and rather sarcastically, on the "credulity" of the supporters of evolution. He was answered promptly, and no less strongly, by a Catholic biologist, who wrote, he said, lest it "should prove either a further stumbling-block or else a source of scandal to young Catholic biologists"; and he referred to an article, written by a priest, in which the writer stated that "a well-known religious scandalized some Catholic school-teachers at Cambridge" by the manner in which he spoke of those who did not hold the traditional view of the production of Eve from Adam.

To say the least, this sort of thing is not very helpful, and it seems to me to indicate the need for a clear presentation, as simple as the subject allows, of the Catholic attitude to evolution. The widespread publicity to which I have already referred, and the many illegitimate applications that are made of the theory in the field of sociology, ethics, psychology, religion and the rest, have made the need more urgent than ever. The only presentation with which most of us are familiar is the one we found (how many years ago?) in our manuals of philosophy and theology. We might well examine whether this presentation is really adapted to the needs of scientists and the public at large.

THE AUTHORS

When we turn to the standard manuals, we find that the attitude towards evolution has softened considerably over the last twenty years or so. The day is long gone when Remer, for example, could summarily dismiss all theories of evolution as "old wives' tales", "*aniles fabulae*". Not long ago a writer in a French ecclesiastical review listed the varying statements of the thesis on evolution in one or two standard authors. They gave a rather painful impression of men fighting a desperate rear-guard action, yielding ground reluctantly, being gradually

forced back by sheer weight of evidence. This would not matter so much to readers trained in philosophy and theology; we are well accustomed to conflict and change of opinion in such matters, but one may well doubt whether a layman would be so complacent.

The question is treated as a rule under the title of Transformism, and the different theories are neatly divided into Absolute and Relative Transformism, Absolute and Relative Fixism. Absolute Transformism and Absolute Fixism are rejected, and need not concern us further here; while the two moderate theories resemble each other so closely that for practical purposes they can be considered as one. The authors give it different names—Theistic Transformism, Moderate Transformism, Mitigated Evolutionism—and are prepared to admit it as a hypothesis. They differ somewhat in their presentation and in their estimate of the value of the theory, but I think we may fairly sum it up under the following heads: (1) God created all things. (2) A special divine intervention was needed for the production of life, and for the formation of the first living organisms. (3) God gave to these primitive organisms the power to produce, down through the ages, different species of living things more complex and more perfect than themselves, with the result that we have now an infinite variety of plants and animals. (4) Each human soul is a separate creation, and there was a special divine intervention in the formation of the body of the first man. (5) The whole human race as it exists today is descended from a single original pair. (6) God guides and controls the whole process of evolution.

This treatment of the question is excellent, and indeed necessary for students of philosophy and theology, who have to survey the whole field of evolutionary theory and are used to the analysis and classification of opinions. It seems to me, however, that it is much too abstruse and complicated for the ordinary Catholic and even for the scientist, and does not answer their requirements. They are not called on to judge whole theories of evolution; what they need is a view of the question which will serve as a guide in the pursuit of scientific studies, and a criterion for judging particular statements made on specific points by the supporters of evolution. Is it possible

to find any approach other than the one adopted in the manuals?

A SUGGESTED APPROACH

At this point we cannot do better than seek guidance from the *magisterium* of the Church, and we are fortunate in finding in the Encyclical *Humani Generis* the very guidance we need. Besides giving the general warning with regard to evolution to which we have already referred, Pius XII mentioned a special point, one of the crucial points where the theory of evolution touches on theology, and gave a pronouncement which must have come as a surprise to many. "The teaching of the Church," he said, "leaves the doctrine of evolution an open question, as long as it confines its speculations to the development, from other living matter already in existence, of the human body." The manner of this statement, even more than its content, is of importance for our present purpose. The Pope does not give any special approval to the evolutionary theory on this point, still less does he assert that it is true; he simply says that it is not contrary to Catholic teaching, and he makes no reference to a special divine intervention. Is this purely negative approach the answer to our difficulty? It is easy to see that the practical consequences are immense. It means that any Catholic may, if he so wishes, adopt this view of the evolutionists, and Catholic scientists may join wholeheartedly with their colleagues of any religious belief or of none in investigating the origins of the human race, since in scientific investigation the body alone is in question; and they need have no fear that in so doing they are in any way compromising their faith.

In the light of this, we may look back at the theory of Moderate Transformism, which we may take as the common teaching of philosophers and theologians with regard to evolution. We see at once that it is a mixture of theology, philosophy, and facts which come into the realm of science. The descent of the human race from a single pair is a theological question, linked with the doctrine of original sin; it is also a matter for scientific investigation; but the theological aspect need not impede the researches of the scientists. It simply means that in

trying to trace the origin of man the Catholic scientist will be looking for a single pair, while the evolutionist who is a non-believer will be looking for remains of a whole group. True, it contradicts one of the tenets of evolution, as Sir Gavin de Beer stated explicitly in his radio address: "That man started as a single pair is at variance with the evidence that species evolve not from single pairs but from whole populations sharing favourable heritable variations in common, and evolving together by natural selection." If the evolutionist is not prepared to accept the assurance of theology that man is a special case, we have only to leave him to his digging for evidence of a group which is not there.

The existence of God, creation, providential control of the universe, the God-given powers of primeval matter, the separate creation of each human soul, are all questions which belong exclusively to theology and philosophy. It is obvious from their very nature that they are not matters for scientific investigation, and the evolutionist who meddles with them has left the realm of science. The Catholic scientist can quite legitimately refuse to follow into these regions, dangerous for the uninitiated, and politely but firmly announce his intention of keeping strictly to his chosen field of science—the fact that he already has the answers to all these questions in the Catholic faith is nobody's business but his own.

Of all the theory of Moderate Transformism only three points are left, and they have certain features in common. All three come within the scope of theology, philosophy and science, and in all three theologians and philosophers generally require a special divine intervention. They are the formation of the body of the first man, the origin of life, and the variation of species. Pius XII, as we have seen, dealt with the first question, and made no reference to divine intervention. Can we not extend this reticence to the other two, and in any case, is it necessary to assert such an intervention here? With regard to the origin of life, St Thomas had no difficulty in admitting "spontaneous generation" of some lower forms of life from decaying inanimate matter, by the action of natural forces. Today, on scientific grounds, we would say he was wrong, but the important thing here is that the idea of life coming from

inanimate elements did not, in his opinion, contradict anything in philosophy or theology, and I think we may safely say that if there had been any such incompatibility he would have seen it. As for the variation of species, since we admit substantial transformations in inorganic elements, why should not one living species be transformed into another simply by the influence of natural causes? In each case it is merely the substituting of one substantial form for another, and all these forms (the soul of man excepted, of course) are drawn from the potentiality of matter. There seems to be no conclusive reason why this could not be due to natural causes alone.

Now, if we leave aside the question of divine intervention, the origin of life and the variation of species remain open questions, to be freely investigated by scientific research. The position is exactly the same as for the formation of man as indicated in *Humani Generis*. We do not assert that life came from inanimate matter, or that the species developed from primitive forms by purely natural process; we simply say that these views are not contrary to Catholic teaching. The practical consequences here are even more far-reaching, for this leaves open the whole field of scientific evolution. Evolution begins with inanimate matter, and ends with the innumerable living forms we see in the world today; science endeavours to ascertain what happened in between, and the Catholic scientist can join in the search for facts which shed light on our earth's history without any fear that what he finds may bring him even apparently into conflict with theology or philosophy.

With all due diffidence, I would suggest that we have here a simple and straightforward approach to the theory of evolution, a way of presenting it which can be grasped not only by the scientist but by any intelligent Catholic. We begin by insisting that evolution is a scientific theory (as Darwin intended it to be), and as such is limited to observable facts and the explanation of those facts. We proceed to draw a firm line of demarcation between the scientific facts and the doctrines of theology and philosophy which form as it were the background to the scientific theory, the wider context which embraces all scientific theories. This is all the easier because these doctrines are nothing more than the ordinary Catholic teaching which

we learn in our catechism—God, creation, Providence, the spiritual, immortal soul of man, and the rest. It only remains to point out that anyone who uses evolution to attack one of these doctrines is going beyond the scope of science, and expressing views which it is not for the scientist to discuss, but for the theologian and the philosopher. The scientific field is wide open to Catholic and non-Catholic alike, and the Catholic will find in his faith a help and a guide, not a hindrance, in his scientific research.

We may conclude with two final remarks. Evolution, despite the claims made for it, remains a hypothesis. There is undoubtedly a great mass of evidence in its favour, but there are also serious gaps, and to proclaim that "Evolution is a fact" is a rhetorical flourish, not a serious scientific statement. But if ever it comes to be accepted as an established theory, it will in no way diminish, but in the opinion of some even enhance, our view of the grandeur of God's work of creation. This was Darwin's own opinion, expressed in the closing pages of *The Origin of Species*, where he defended himself vigorously against the charge of atheism. Since this year sees the centenary of its publication, it will not be inappropriate to end by quoting the last lines of the book: "There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, while this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being, evolved."

T. FINAN, C.S.S.P.

THE APPROACH TO THE ACT OF FAITH

"EX UMBRIS ET IMAGINIBUS IN VERITATEM"

THE inscription chosen by Cardinal Newman for his own memorial tablet describes the convert's journey to the Faith. He is like a man anxious in the twilight before the dawn. He passes through the shadows of ignorance and the phantoms

of prejudice as the light of knowledge and the grace of God reveal more and more of the truth to his soul.

Newman's epitaph suggests a natural division of the subject. The letters of students of the Catholic Enquiry Centre Course, with which I am here concerned, tell of the difficulties concerning the Faith which, like shadows, oppress the minds of enquirers and the many different aspects of it which appeal to them.

There is less to be learnt from the difficulties, so I will deal with them first and perfunctorily. They are, in the main, of two kinds—Protestant and rationalistic. There is no pattern in them any more than there is pattern in changing shadows and spectres. For convenience sake, we may group the Protestant ones under the four principles which are the basis of Protestant theology, namely, *Sola gratia* and *Sola fide* of Luther and Melancthon, the *Soli Deo gloria* of Calvin and the Sovereign Authority of Sacred Scripture common to all Protestantism. Fr Bouyer in his "Spirit and Forms of Protestantism" shows that these are all statements of Catholic theology, only the negations added to them being heretical.

Sola gratia and *Sola fide* were taught by the Councils of Orange in 1529 and Trent in 1563. Faith is the beginning of salvation and without it it is impossible to please God. We are justified by the Blood of Christ and not by our own good works. The heretics erred in concluding that grace changes nothing in us, that good works before and after faith are of no avail, and that religion is a wholly private affair of the believer's experience of the Lord Jesus through faith. Hence, the Protestant antipathy to organized religion summed up in the words of Dean Inge: "You cannot be saved by proxy."

Christians who accept these negations as first principles needing no proof harp with infinite variations on the same themes. Thus: If faith in the Lord Jesus is all that is necessary, why all this organized religion of ceremonies, sacraments, sacramentals? Why religion without intention, such as infant Baptism, the repetition of many prayers, religious actions without prayers, prayers in a language not understood of the people? If we are saved by the Blood of Christ, why another sacrifice, Purgatory, penances, indulgences, relics of saints, fish on Friday, and celibacy of the clergy?

Calvin's basic principle, *Soli Deo gloria*, is Catholic doctrine expressed in every prayer of the Church addressed to God *Per Christum Dominum nostrum*. It is expressed in the Jesuit motto: *Ad majorem Dei gloriam*, and the prayer of the great mystics. But Calvin, fearing the God of Sinai, will have no strange Gods before Him and will give religious honour to none but Him. It is then a species of idolatry to give honour to the Blessed Virgin Mary, saints, popes, bishops, priests, and it is sheer idolatry to bend the knee before images. Since none but God and "The One Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus" have authority over us, authoritarianism in religion is evil, and gives rise to such abominations as the cruelties of the Inquisition, the Fires of Smithfield and the persecution of Protestants in Spain and Colombia, all of which are sufficient to discredit the claims of Rome. The Petrine texts cannot mean what Catholics say they mean and must be explained otherwise. Bad popes and mistakes and contradictions in papal pronouncements make this obvious.

The Sovereign Authority of Scripture is Catholic doctrine if it means that the Bible is the Word of God and provides the foundation of all sacred science. The negation that nothing outside the Bible can have the divine guarantee is the heresy which gives rise to many objections. The doctrines of the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption and Papal Infallibility are adding to the Word of God—denial of the Cup to the laity is taking away from it. The Catholic Church, like the scribes and pharisees, stands condemned by the words of Christ: "You have made the Commandment of God of non-effect by your tradition" (Matt. xv, 6). Why don't Catholics read the Bible? Why do they have a different Bible? And where (this over and over again with the flourish of a *coup de grce*), where is such and such teaching found written in the Bible? From the doubting come such questions as: How do we know the Bible is true? How can we be sure of its text? What are the differences in the different Bibles?

Anglicans with more developed theology will fail to see any difference between the Catholic religion and their own except for the Papacy, the supremacy of which is without certain basis in Sacred Scripture and was rejected by the early British

Church which remained Catholic throughout the sixteenth-century reform and is Catholic today. They ask querulously, Why will Catholics not co-operate with us in ecumenism? and Why will they not worship with us on occasions?

From all sources come questions on the great Christian mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Divinity of Christ, the Holy Eucharist, the Virgin Birth, and the perpetual virginity of our Lady, particularly in view of the Scriptures' references to the "brethren of the Lord".

The popularized philosophy of the rationalists and the general puzzlement of a people untaught, prompt another set of questions—on the existence of God and evolution, the soul, miracles, the problem of evil and pain and, above all, birth control, divorce and Catholic laws of marriage. One can often see a connexion between these and some recent television or radio broadcast, such as Professor Lovell's recent Reith lectures on science, or an article in a newspaper.

Day by day the questions come, symptoms of the disease of heresy, and the weary "drudge" with the resounding title of *Director of Studies* must day by day hand out pills and prescriptions. For pills we have a large variety of C.T.S. pamphlets, forty-three printed or duplicated answers for enclosure with letters and thirty-five set answers to be typed into letters as needed. As for the prescriptions, he makes them up from the rows of reference books on the shelves behind him, like bottles in a chemist's shop, and dictates them to patient stenographers.

It is his business, as it is that of every priest instructing converts and defending the Faith, to show that positive Protestant doctrine is Catholic and only the negative is heretical. We must say, for instance, "Faith is absolutely necessary for salvation, but it must be animated by hope and charity." "We can go direct to God for forgiveness, but He has also given us the sacrament of Penance to give us grace to improve." "We can have religious experiences, but need the voice of authority also, lest we be led astray." "The Bible is the Word of God, but He has put it into the hands of the Church through which He wrote it, and it is for her to use it in her mission of teaching His truth." "All the truth you love, we teach—and more besides that you would love also did you but understand it. Here is

the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth." And always we urge them to pray for faith and send them an attractive prayer card printed by Westbrook.

"EX UMBRIS ET IMAGINIBUS
IN VERITATEM"

I turn with more relish to the positive side of my subject, for shadows are best dispelled by light. Our most useful apologetic is to show the whole truth rather than to defend its details. We will make such demonstration more effective if we know how different aspects of the truth appeal to enquiring minds.

I am not here concerned with the act of faith itself, which is made solely on the authority of God revealing and with the aid of the supernatural gift which so elevates and enlightens the soul that it walks with the assurance of one in the full light of the sun; I am rather concerned with the motives of credibility or the evidences for the truth as considered by souls in complete darkness of unbelief, or in various stages of the twilight of the undeveloped faith of non-Catholic Christians.

The Vatican Council tells us that the motives of credibility are: first, miracles and prophecy; secondly, the Church Herself, "the sign raised among the nations" (Isa. xi, 12), One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic; thirdly, the satisfaction which she provides of the heart's yearning for goodness and beauty and the peace which the world cannot understand. The appeal of the first two motives to the intellect is essential; the third, relying as it does on internal evidence is insufficient in itself, but of great value in making the first two more convincing.

The Protestant heresy that faith is an internal religious experience due solely to the direct influence of God, inclined the classical theologians to insist so much on the absolute validity of the external evidence that they neglected the psychology of the would-be believer. Even we, of our generation, came forth from our books inclined to think that with the sword of logic and the shield of the Bible we could beat any fair-minded adversary to his knees before the altar. We had to learn that no one is convinced by argument, a lesson taught by

Newman in his *Grammar of Assent* as long ago as 1870 and developed enthusiastically by French and German theologians in the first half of this century, but neglected so much by us that many greet as original Mgr Knox's presentation of it in the chapters of his unfinished book which Mr Evelyn Waugh is publishing in *The Month*.

In his *Grammar of Assent* Newman examines the workings of the human mind in its arriving at assent. The syllogism never convinced anybody. It is a fly in amber, neat and beautiful, but cut off from reality on all sides, beginning with a first principle that not all will accept and ending with a conclusion that adds nothing to the premise. It unfolds and vindicates truth and is valuable as a training in right thinking, but it is as remote from the world of reality as scales are from a symphony, or foot-drill from a hand to hand engagement with the enemy. In life men are moved by what is real and vivid.

Logic [says Newman] makes but a sorry rhetoric with the multitude. First shoot round corners and you may not despair of converting with a syllogism. . . . After all, man is *not* a reasoning animal; he is a seeing, feeling, contemplating, acting animal. He is influenced by what is direct and precise. . . . Life is not long enough for a religion of inferences (*Grammar*, p. 96).

Newman is not, of course, dethroning the intellect, but showing that it is much more subtle and complex than any one of its operations.

Man reaches assent through "the accumulation of probabilities" rather than by any one line of argument. The mind has a detective's power of putting together clues, suggesting probabilities and arriving at absolute conviction. This power Newman calls "the illative sense". Fr D'Arcy in his *Nature of Belief* acclaims the theory but quarrels with the artificiality of the term and says it means simply "interpretation", or the "realization" of the meaning of the clues. Newman's example of it is that of the farmer who from scores of signs of which he is hardly conscious makes a firm judgement about the weather. All men assent to such reasonings which cannot be proved separately.

Blondel and the Immanentists at the turn of the century made the mistake of dethroning the intellect, saying that the aspirations of the human soul for truth and peace are more powerful motives of credibility than the external signs enumerated by the Vatican Council. Newman is cleared of any such charge, although they claimed him as a supporter. He is concerned with the psychology of the man using his reason in examining the evidence for the Faith. The validity of his theory has been admitted by all modern theologians, who, in accepting it, have developed it and added to its theological content. Roger Aubert in his imposing work *La Problème de l'Acte de Foi* (Louvain 1950) makes a survey of their teaching. There is confirmation of many of their ideas in the letters of students of the Catholic Enquiry Centre Course.

Fr Rousselot, lecturer at the *Institut Catholique* de Paris till 1914, sought to develop Newman's philosophy in the light of theology and to apply it to the act of faith of the uneducated man, which, after all, is the ordinary act of faith. The extent of the reading of millions is the sports or fashion columns and short news items in a copiously illustrated newspaper. The man in the street in the face of complex evidence has need of the grace of God to help the natural processes of his intellect long before he receives the gift of faith. After this grace, nothing assists him more in finding the truth than his innate love of the good and the beautiful, particularly as seen reflected in the person of one whom he loves.

The German Jesuit, Fr Przywara, sees in the use of Newman's "illative sense" the explanation of many religious experiences. The mind, aided by grace, has been making rapid inferences for a long time and realizes their implications with such thrilling suddenness that it is like an illumination. "The penny drops" as we say. The final penny gets the right permutation and all the pent-up pennies of months and years come tumbling into the jackpot.

Karl Adam attaches great importance to the congregation of the worshipping Church in the development of the prospective convert's faith. The first Christians received the Holy Ghost within the ecclesiastical community and the faith of the Catholic child develops within the family of the parish. There

too the non-Catholic is often brought to his encounter with the living God. Karl Adam writes eloquently of the value of religious experiences. Pentecost, he says, is constantly being repeated in the Church. Special occasions such as Midnight Masses, processions, First Communion celebrations and, above all, parish missions, are powerful influences in the development of the faith of both Catholics and non-Catholics.

Thus men are drawn to the truth by as many ways as there are points of the compass. They are convinced more by a thousand clues suggesting probabilities than a clear line of argument, more by what they see and hear than by what they read, and their thinking can never be isolated from their emotional experiences. The grace of God helps the well-disposed enquirer in his search long before the gift of faith is given.

These contentions are borne out by the letters we receive. To every quotation given in illustration of these points could be added a dozen more.

Fr Rousselot's stress on the importance of love in the approach to the faith is justified by the experience of all parochial clergy and is well illustrated in our letters. The majority of converts are attracted to the Faith by seeing its beauty reflected in the life of one they love and longing to share in what is obviously a joyful experience. A girl of twenty writes: "When I am at Mass, particularly at the elevation of the Host, I have noticed how much it means to my young man (and others round about), but to me the priest is just lifting something in the air; I never really feel God's presence. This all makes me rather disappointed and unhappy (jealous sometimes too)."

That girl, secretly studying the face of her lover bowed in adoration, is representative of many. Often it is the sharing of pain in love that brings the soul near to God. The atheistic wife of a lapsed Catholic at death's door sees him long for the priest and rejoice at absolution, goes with him to Lourdes and is edified by his devotion, and feels the reality of his Faith when he meets death calmly and peacefully. "I was with him when he died, and the feeling I had at that moment of his death was all the proof I need of everlasting life."

Next to love of man for woman is the love of parents for children. A father writes: "There is a blank in my life. I stay at

home on Sunday mornings and help with odd jobs in the house. My wife and children go to Mass. What is it that they bring back, Father, that I have not got?" There is a man whose daughter went to a convent school and his formerly cynical wife began to be attracted to the Faith which seemed so beautiful to the child. He writes: "Frankly, the reason behind my initial enquiry stemmed from my desire to protect my daughter from Catholic influences." A Baptist with three unbaptized children seeks to find out if he is depriving them of anything, and having learnt to believe has his whole family baptized. Often non-Catholic parents of Catholic children seek information to help them in the answering of questions and are themselves convinced.

The power of good example in religion is inestimable. Our brethren in the priesthood throughout the country attract many souls to the Church without realizing it. The pagan wife of a lapsed Catholic brings him and his four children to the Church because of her admiration for the zeal of the parish priest who visited her so often. The hospital visiting of priests has amazing effects on people at a time when they are in need of the comforts of religion. This example is typical of many: "Every day the Catholic priest came round the hospital visiting the R.C. patients and the Sister accompanied him. This day he stopped at my window and just smiled, and a few days later he saw me sitting outside on a garden seat. He came over to me and said 'I am so glad you are getting better. God bless you.' I cannot tell you how much his words meant and particularly his manner." Later came the moment of realization when, as described by Fr Przywara, the accumulated inferences assumed the force of an illumination. She writes: "I kept walking round the kitchen with one thought running through my brain 'You must find the priest who visits at X. Isolation Hospital'. At length I left everything, put on my hat and went round to St Mary's Presbytery."

Nuns teaching non-Catholic children at convent schools lead many parents to a study of the Faith. Here is a typical remark: "Both my husband and I have learnt to love the nuns. They, more than anybody, have inspired my interest in the Catholic Faith." But the example of good Catholics everywhere

is a powerful influence. A semi-literate woman writes of her neighbours: "I watched them nearly every morning of my married life, nineteen years, going to morning Mass. . . . How they watch their daughter's three children while their daughter and their son-in-law go to Mass Sunday morning." Perhaps there are many wistful faces hidden behind front-room curtains at Mass time on Sunday mornings. And here is a graphic account of how one piece of example worked powerfully for fifteen years. A Welshman writes of a wartime experience in Holland: "I heard someone coming along the road, all in the snow and bitter cold. I had to halt the person as was usual those days and still remember being told by the two children and a young girl in her teens that they were on the way to Mass. It made me think a lot."

Even the intellectuals are convinced more by persons than ideas. Jacques Maritain and his future wife, Raissa Oumansoff, were first attracted to the Faith by the holiness of the household of Léon Bloy.

Many letters confirm Karl Adam's ideas of the importance both of the worshipping congregation and of religious experiences. The simple dignity of the Mass is impressive, much more so if there is a friend to whisper a few words of explanation. But the crowds of ordinary people in unself-conscious and quiet adoration such as is not seen in any other place, fill the observer with wonder and awe, and make him long to share in this joyful experience.

One terrified as a child by revivalist religion speaks of seeing the Mass on television: "I did not find it strange, only quiet and holy, and all the faces seemed so happy and peaceful." A mother writes of the crowds: "It is something quite outside the experience of anyone who has never been to a Catholic Church before and very wonderful. . . . There were children there each time, with their mothers, which is very wonderful." The unity in Catholicity of the congregation often impresses. One man says that this gathering of all types, dresses, degrees of people, but each quite definitely sharing in something is the finest proof he knows of the claims of the Catholic Church. A Quaker, prominent in public life and active in ecumenical work, was convinced of the Church's claim by finding the prayer of quiet at

Mass. "Once having gone to Mass I could no longer take a detached view. The Mass was for me the most joyful experience I have ever had! Occasionally, in a truly 'gathered' Quaker meeting the sense of the living Presence has been real—but this was true every time I went to Mass."

The culmination of a long enquiry comes not rarely in a religious experience before the Blessed Sacrament or at Mass. A very sane young man writes: "At Mass last Sunday, just before and during Communion for those fortunate people who may take it, I nearly broke down. I felt my heart was ready to burst. If I could have been alone, I would have flung myself down and wept. Never have I had such an experience. I do not think it was emotionalism. I felt that all my barriers had broken down and I felt that I had come home."

We feel the "real absence" in Protestant churches. Many correspondents tell how they were awed by a sense of the Real Presence—what one person calls "the living silence". One young man tells how the sanctuary lamp is an aid to contemplation.

Human wisdom might suggest that statues of the Sacred Heart, medals, Rosary beads, are best left unmentioned until the fish is well hooked. In fact, these help to convince many, and many have a longing for our Blessed Lady. One writes: "I have always had a sneaking regard for our Lady, but, because of the teaching of my church, I have felt it to be wrong. . . . It is with relief that I now find I can pray to her and not be doing wrong."

The newspaper advertisements which have had the greatest effect have been the ones depicting the more controversial and characteristic elements of the Catholic Faith—the Mass, the Rosary (associated with our Blessed Lady) and the Pope.

So, the marks of the Church are seen in the lives and the worship of the Catholic people and are appraised by the intellect often encouraged by love and religious experiences and always aided by grace. But all these things have to be brought into perspective by a more or less systematic study of the Catholic Church. This is the thing that so many millions lack. At some point in these vague searchings comes suddenly a Press advertisement with a picture that rings a bell in the mind of the seeker, or a friend offers a card which is an application for the

Catholic Enquiry Centre Course and there is immediately direction and purpose in the search for truth.

Bishop Dwyer's twenty-one leaflets bring things into perspective with overwhelming effect. The human soul is moulded in such a way that Christian truth fits it perfectly, and most who study it in these clear pages illuminated with apt examples, welcome it with wondering joy. Particularly remarkable is the number of teen-agers who, without revealing their age, study the Course and are swept off their feet with enthusiasm. Some who come to scoff are terrified when the stones of their ignorance are kicked over and the prejudices scurry like vermin from the light. Some are convinced and put off the day of decision. Many are confirmed in their belief of the positive aspects of their Protestantism and are satisfied to stay as they are. All are enlightened. But even for those who are ultimately convinced the time of full sunrise is yet to come.

Fides ex auditu. "Or how shall they believe Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they be sent? Faith then cometh by hearing" (Rom. x, 14-16). There can be no substitute for the living voice of the preacher and a personal encounter with the grace of the priesthood. The most important piece of information given by the Catholic Enquiry Centre to the enquirer is the address of the nearest presbytery with the assurance: "Any of the priests there will be delighted to help you in your further study of the Catholic Faith." And we are sure that the greeting that he will receive will be for him, in more senses than one, like the rising of the sun.

E. K. TAYLOR, C.M.S.

THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDECH

THE epistle to the Hebrews seems to be addressed to former Jewish priests now converted to Christianity, to combat their nostalgia for the priestly rites of the Old Testament. To do this, the author contrasts New Testament worship with the imperfections of the Old Testament; and in particular, the Old Testament priesthood with that of Christ.

The superiority of Christ's priesthood is based on that of Melchisedech: our Lord is said to be a high priest "of the order of Melchisedech". Such an assertion must be based ultimately on Gen. xiv, 18–20, the only source-material available on the person, character and office of Melchisedech. (Psalm 109, the only other reference to Melchisedech, is also based on the passage in Genesis.) Our task is to see how the author argues from the scanty information given there and what is the foundation of his arguments. The questions we ask are: what essential characteristics does the author see in the priesthood of Melchisedech? and how does he arrive at these conclusions?

Let us look first at the text of Genesis. Abram has been called by God to found "a great people", and after various wanderings settled "in the valley of Mamre, near Hebron", with the wealth he had acquired in his wanderings; while his nephew Lot settled near the shore of the Dead Sea. In the course of a military expedition by some northern kings, Lot is taken prisoner. Abram pursues the invaders, rescues Lot and the rest of the booty, and returns in triumph to Lot's home. There he is met by a delegation which included the king of Sodom and Melchisedech, king of Salem (presumably Jerusalem):

Melchisedech, too, was there, king of Salem. And he, priest as he was of the most high God, brought out bread and wine with him, and gave him his benediction: On Abram be the blessing of the most high God, maker of heaven and earth. . . . To him, Abram gave the tithes of all he had won.

That is the sum-total of all that history has to tell us about Melchisedech. Everyone will agree that it is not much on which to base an argument for the priesthood of Christ. So we are not surprised to find that the argument seems to be based largely on a play on words: on Melchisedech's name, which means king (*melech*) of justice (*sedech*), and on his city, Salem, which means peace. This type of argument is familiar in Rabbinical exegesis, and is in accordance with the tradition of the Bible itself: "The name which Adam gave his wife was Eve—life—because she was the mother of all living men."¹

¹ Other examples are Moses, "taken from the waters" (Ex. ii, 10); Ichabod, "there is no glory" (I Kings iv, 21); etc.

But what, if any, is the substance underlying this play on words? The author of the epistle argues in the first place from Melchisedech's kingship. Now a king is one who commands and rules; one who directs the people to their common welfare; one who ensures justice and peace—justice, not only in the sense of legal justice, the repression of injustice, but justice in the full sense of right order; and peace not only meaning absence of war but the fullest expansion of social well-being. This is the function of the ideal king:

God, give thy power of judgement to the king, that he may judge thy people in justice; let the mountains bring forth peace for the people, and the hills bring forth justice. The kings of Tharsis and the islands will bring him gifts, and all the kings of earth will pay him reverence; he will free the poor from the oppressor, and corn will grow high on the mountain-tops; and in his days shall spring up justice and peace abundantly (cf. Ps. lxxi, 1-16).

Ideally, then, the person best suited for this office is a person whose rule is God's rule; whose commands are the commands of God; one who truly represents God. But it is the priest who has these requisite qualities. He is in fellowship with God and speaks as his representative. The priest blesses—"benedicents", uttering good things; and for the Hebrew, blessing, like cursing, is effective utterance, tending to bring about the good that it expresses. And that, it will be noted, is precisely what Melchisedech does here. Westcott¹ points out that he is presented as a "priest, not in sacrificing but in blessing, that is, in communicating the fruits of an efficacious sacrifice already made".

In Melchisedech, then, the kingly and priestly functions overlap. The king whose task it is to establish God's right order and God's peace on earth is also the priest whose blessing brings these qualities into being. That is the order of Melchisedech's priesthood—a kingly priesthood establishing justice and peace. In other words, the argument of *Hebrews*, at first sight based on nothing more than an extrinsic similarity of verbal epithets, is in reality much more penetrating; the play on words is only a means of conveying a more intrinsic truth,

¹ *Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 201.

But these ideas seem to be merely preliminary in the author's mind. What is more important for him is the idea of eternity:

He has no father or mother, no pedigree, no date of birth or death: there he stands, eternally, a priest, the true figure of the son of God (Heb. vii, 3).

And again, at first sight, the argument appears to be purely literary. Clearly, Melchisedech did in fact have a father and a mother, and he did die. The author is arguing not from the facts, but from the way Melchisedech appears in history—suddenly, unexpectedly and briefly; without any explanation of his origin or any account of his subsequent fate. The argument is based merely on the silence of the text, not on the historical fact.

But what is not true of Melchisedech as a person may be true of the order of his priesthood; and it is that order, not the person of Melchisedech about which we know so little, that forms the term of the comparison. The point of the argument is in the contrast with the order of the Aaronic priesthood. Now, what is the essence of the Aaronic priesthood?

So leaving Cades behind them, they reached mount Hor on the edge of the Edomite country; and here it was that the Lord said to Moses . . . Take Aaron and his son with thee to the top of mount Hor, strip the father of his priestly garments and clothe his son Eleazar with them instead; there Aaron shall die (Numbers xx, 22-6).

And from Aaron to Eleazar, from Eleazar to Phinees, from father to son the priesthood passed. The order of the Aaronic priesthood depended on the hereditary principle. After the return from exile, priests who could not establish their descent were cast out of the priesthood (Esd. ii, 62). This is the boast of the Aaronic priesthood—but it is also its chief weakness. For an hereditary priesthood is shown by that very fact to be temporary and transitory. It shares in the imperfection of the whole Mosaic order whose worship is expressed in the sacrifice of "blood of goats or oxen" (Heb. ix, 12), in a temple made with human hands (Heb. ix, 11). It is an order governed by a

Law which can make sin but cannot unmake it (cf. Rom. iii, 20), and like everything else about that Law, it was essentially promissory, pointing forward to that which would bring it to perfection:

What then is the purpose of the Law? It was brought in to make room for transgression, while we waited for the coming of that posterity to whom the promise had been made. . . . The Law was our tutor, bringing us to Christ to find our faith and justification (Gal. iii, 19 ff.; cf. Rom. vii, 1 ff.).

Similarly, then, the priesthood of the Old Law, dependent on the hereditary principle, was temporary and intended to make way for something more perfect: "Of those priests there was a succession, since death denies them permanence; whereas Jesus continues for ever, and his priestly office is unchanging" (Heb. vii, 23 f.).

Now what of the priesthood of Melchisedech? The author sees in the omission of any account of his genealogy and succession a striking contrast with the priesthood of Aaron. He is not a priest according to the order of Aaron. He is not even of the order of Abraham—he does not belong to that race with which God made a covenant. But he does belong to the race with which God had made an earlier covenant—the covenant with Noe, described in Gen. viii, 21 ff. When God made the world, he established a harmony which included the moral and the material laws of creation. Sin was a disruption of this harmony which involved the disruption of man's harmony with the material creation of which he was a part—thus the flood. But now, by His covenant with Noe, God brings in a new principle, a principle of mercy: no longer will sin, rebellion of the rulers of material creation, involve as it should the destruction of the world. The laws of nature will continue to function in spite of sin: "While the earth stands, seed-time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night shall keep their course unaltered" (Gen. viii, 22). And this order is to be eternal: "This, God said, shall be the pledge of the promise I am making to you and to all living creatures, your companions, eternally: I will set my bow in the clouds to be a pledge of my covenant

with creation . . . and as I look upon it, I will remember the eternal covenant" (Gen. ix, 12 ff.).

And it is of this order, eternal and universal, that Melchisedech is a priest. He is a priest of the most high God, the God known in creation and conscience (cf. Rom. i, 19; ii, 14-15); and he worships with gifts that were dependent on the preservation of "seed-time and harvest", bread and wine. He is priest-king of justice and peace—the harmony and right order of God's creation.

Melchisedech is a priest of the eternal covenant, just as Aaron was priest of the Mosaic covenant. But that earlier covenant was not superseded by the covenant with the chosen people. It has outlived them. Their covenant ceased with the coming of Christ who came to call both Jew and Gentile. The universal and eternal covenant of mercy with the whole of creation carries on, now completed and perfected in Christ in whom all creation is fulfilled (cf. Col. i, 14-17). And as priest of that eternal order Melchisedech "stands eternally a priest the true figure of the Son of God".

A. O'D

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

LOST MASS STIPENDS—TRANSMISSION AT REDUCED RATE

If a priest has lost the money received by him, at a higher than the usual rate, for a series of Mass intentions, can he satisfy his obligation by having the Masses said at a reduced rate? (O. B.)

REPLY

Canon 829: "Licet sine culpa illius qui onere celebrandi gravatur, Missarum eleemosynae iam perceptae perierint, obligatio non cessat."

Canon 840, §1: "Qui Missarum stipes manuales ad alios transmittit, debet acceptas integre transmittere, nisi aut oblator expresse permittat aliquid retinere, aut certo constet excessum supra taxam dioecesanam datam fuisse intuitu personae."

It is clear from the first of these two canons that the priest in question certainly remains bound either to say the Masses himself, or to transfer them to others for fulfilment. In the latter event, if neither of the exceptions mentioned in the second canon is applicable, the literal interpretation of its rule would seem to require that the full amount received be transmitted.

Many commentators are content to state the two rules, without adverting to the question whether the rule of integral transmission must be literally applied even to the case in which the money received has been lost. One of the few who does examine it, and very thoroughly, is Dr John McCarthy. His conclusion is that "a strong case can be made for the more lenient view which would allow a priest to transfer a smaller stipend for manual Masses when the original offerings have perished without any fault on his part".¹

In brief, his argument is that the obligation of integral transmission is not certainly one of natural law, or, at least, that the natural reason behind it (to prevent unjust self-enrichment) is not applicable to the case in question, since the transmitter is impoverished rather than enriched; that the purpose of the positive law, which is to eliminate "quaelibet species negotiationis et mercaturae"² is likewise not disregarded; and finally that, since the literal application of canon 840, §1, to the case envisaged by canon 829 is more than usually "odious", we are justified in following a narrower interpretation which "fully secures the purpose of the law, and seems more in accordance with the principles of equity and with the canonical and theological teaching on kindred matters".³

The same opinion is briefly but confidently asserted by Wouters⁴ and Regatillo-Zalba,⁵ and quoted approvingly by

¹ *Problems in Theology*, I, "The Sacraments", p. 131.

² Canon 827.

³ Op. cit., p. 133.

⁴ *Theol. Mor.*, II, n. 224.

⁵ *Summa Theol. Mor.*, III, n. 269.

Canon Mahoney.¹ We consider that it is intrinsically probable and therefore that it can be followed with a safe conscience. It might however be advisable to explain the situation to the intended recipients of the transmitted obligations. If then they agree to accept them at a reduced stipend, there can be no question of the lawfulness of the arrangement.²

PLASTIC SURGERY FOR BEAUTY'S SAKE

Plastic surgeons are often called upon nowadays to exercise their skill merely in order to "improve" their clients' looks, e.g. to substitute a *retroussé* nose for one of the hooked variety. What is the morality of this kind of surgery? (S.P.)

REPLY

From the moral point of view, strange as it may sound to the beautifiers and their clients, it counts as a "mutilation", and must therefore be judged by the same principles as govern any other form of mutilation. As Pope Pius XII explained,³ man is not absolute master of his own body and cannot therefore freely dispose of it as he pleases.

He is bound to respect the immanent teleology fixed by nature. The right he possesses over the faculties and forces of his human nature is one of *usage* and is limited by their natural finality (purposefulness). Because he is a usufructuary and not a proprietor, his power to do acts which involve anatomical or functional destruction or mutilation is not unlimited. But, in virtue of the principle of totality which entitles him to utilize the services of the organism as a whole, he can dispose of the individual parts by destroying or mutilating them, when and to the extent in which this is necessary for the good of the entity as a whole, in order to ensure its existence, or to avoid, and

¹ *Questions and Answers*, I, "The Sacraments", p. 105.

² Cf. Noldin-Schmitt, *Summa Theol. Mor.*, III, n. 192.

³ Address to the First International Congress on Histopathology of the Nervous System, 14 September 1952 (*A.A.S.*, 1952, XLIV, p. 782).

naturally to repair, grave and lasting damage which cannot otherwise be avoided or repaired.¹

Applying these principles, in a later address,² to the moral question raised by what he called "aesthetic surgery", he began by observing that physical beauty, though it occupies a relatively modest place in the Christian scale of values—hence the mistrust with which it is viewed in ascetical literature, is none the less a value, a corporeal good intrinsically ordained to the wholeness of man, not such indeed as to impose a duty of taking extraordinary measures to achieve or preserve it, but yet deserving of esteem and care. Even, therefore, when a person of aesthetically normal appearance seeks to have his or her features improved by plastic surgery, out of mere regard for aesthetic perfection, there is nothing intrinsically either good or bad in the object, and consequently its morality will depend on the circumstances of the concrete instance.

In the moral evaluation of these, the Pope explained, the principal conditions are that the intention must be right, the general health of the subject must not be exposed to notable risk, and the motives must be reasonable and proportionate to the extraordinary character of the means adopted. For example, he said, a surgical intervention is evidently unlawful when its purpose is merely to make the subject more seductive, or to enable a criminal to escape justice, or when it does harm to the regular physical functions, or is wanted out of mere vanity or caprice of fashion. On the other hand, he added, there are not a few motives which justify intervention, or even make it positively advisable. Thus, some physical deformities, or even mere imperfections, can have grave psychological effects on the person concerned, such as a sense of inferiority which, developed into a complex, induces a serious abnormality of character and conduct; or they may prove a notable hindrance to social intercourse or to the public exercise of a profession. Aesthetic surgery in cases of this kind, he concluded, "far from opposing the will of God in restoring perfection to the greatest work of His visible

¹ Ibid.

² To the Tenth National Convention of the Italian Society of Plastic Surgery, 4 October 1958 (*A.A.S.*, 1958, L, pp. 957 ff.).

creation, seems rather to conform better with it, and renders clearer testimony to its wisdom and goodness".¹

No general answer, therefore, can be given to the question whether it is lawful to have the shape of one's nose re-fashioned by plastic surgery. It may well be that the operation is motivated by mere vanity; in which case, of course, it is a sin, though, in view of the minor character of the mutilation, scarcely grave. On the other hand, if a new shape of nose will better serve the whole man (or more probably woman) either psychologically or socially, and no harm is apprehended, it can easily be justified.

THE MODERN ATTITUDE TO SUNDAY SERVILE WORK

The modern attitude to work and exercise is very different from that of fifty years ago. In view of this, does the law forbidding servile work on Sundays still bind under pain of sin? (Operarius.)

REPLY

Canon 1248: "Festis de praecerto diebus Missa audienda est; et abstinendum ab operibus servilibus, actibus forensibus, itemque, nisi aliud ferant legitimae consuetudines aut pecuniorum indulta, publico mercatu, nundinis, aliisque publicis exemptionibus et venditionibus."

Canon 27, §1: "Iuri divino sive naturali sive positivo nulla consuetudo potest aliquatenus derogare; sed neque iuri ecclesiastico praeiudicium afferit, nisi fuerit rationabilis et legitime per annos quadraginta continuos et completos praescripta; contra legem vero ecclesiasticam quae clausulam contineat futuras consuetudines prohibentem, sola praescribere potest rationabilis consuetudo centenaria aut immemorabilis."

Canon 29: "Consuetudo est optima legum interpres."

The law continues to bind under pain of sin until it is abrogated by the legislator or by a contrary custom which fulfils

¹ Loc. cit., pp. 959-60.

the conditions required for his legally declared consent. There is no evidence that the modern attitude to work and exercise has so far induced a custom of this kind. What it has done is to induce theologians to revise their concept of the kind of servile work forbidden by the Sunday law.

Although the Sunday repose is motivated by a natural moral obligation (that of devoting some of one's time more directly to the things of God), the particular form given to it in canon 1248 (prohibition of servile, forensic and commercial activities) is clearly not of natural law. Nor is it imposed by the divine positive law of the Israelite Sabbath, because that law ceased with the covenant to which it belonged. "The observance of Sunday," wrote St Thomas Aquinas, "succeeds in the New Law to the observance of the Sabbath, not in virtue of the precept of the (Old) Law, but because of the statute of the Church and the custom of the Christian people."¹ Moreover, though canon 1248 makes express provision for contrary custom only in regard to commercial activities, it contains no clause forbidding future customs contrary to the prohibition of servile work. It is therefore certain, from the general norm of canon 27, that a contrary custom of non-observance, reasonably based on the honest *mores populi* and legitimately prescribed, without opposition of authority, over a period of forty continuous and complete years, would abrogate the prohibition in the area covered by the custom. In fact, however, we think it would be an exaggeration to say that a custom of general non-observance has persisted for the last forty years among the *maior et senior pars communitatis* in this country. It is true that, as a result of practices necessitated by the war and prolonged by the subsequent shortage of man-power, there has been a considerable increase in the amount of paid Sunday work, but this has been done, not so much in disregard of the law, but on the plea, not altogether convincing, that the urgency of the particular job, or the worker's need of the double pay provides a sufficient excuse from its observance. Nor has the ecclesiastical authority shown any tendency to let the law fall into desuetude. On the con-

¹ *Summa Theologica*, 2a 2ae, qu. 122, a. 4, ad 4 m. It is therefore theologically wrong and catechetically misleading to refer to the Sunday repose as the Christian Sabbath, or to invoke the scriptural text in confirmation or interpretation of the canon law, which dates, in its present form, from the sixth century.

trary, the Congregation of the Council issued a circular letter to the bishops of Italy, 25 March 1952, deplored the increasing violation of the Sunday repose by unnecessary public manual labour and calling for practical remedies.¹

On the other hand, as a result of the changed modern attitude to handicrafts, there has been a widespread and justifiable tendency to re-interpret the prohibition of servile work in the light of modern customs and conceptions. This is as it should be. "Loi coutumière à l'origine, la loi du repos dominical est demeurée loi coutumière."² Unfortunately, from the seventeenth century until quite recently, most of the moral manualists paid little heed to this fact. Not only were they content to define the term "servile" in the sense it had had when all manual labour was more or less reserved to serfs and menials, as though the social framework of the sixth century were divinely fixed,³ but, one after another, they copied out Busembaum's list of works considered servile, as though the customs of his day (he died in 1668) were as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. There were, of course, exceptions: Ballerini (ob. 1881), for example, wrote: "Common opinion and the custom it creates afford the best explanation of the law and usually provide a better definition of servile work than any laboriously thought up by authors";⁴ but the present century was well under way before there was any general effort to bring the notion into line with the common opinion and custom generated by the Industrial Revolution.

Nowadays, most theologians are more concerned to make the law workable and to achieve its purpose, than to keep the Busembaum categories intact. In the Middle Ages, when intellectual work was predominantly orientated to the sacred science and mainly reserved to clerics, the three categories of activity prohibited by the law, servile (then equated with manual), forensic, and commercial, adequately covered all secular occupations likely to interfere with the sanctification of the Sunday.

¹ A.A.S., 1952, XLIV, pp. 232-3.

² Villain, *Histoire de commandements de l'Eglise*, p. 103.

³ Sixth-century legislators had a practical, if untheological, reason for invoking the Sabbath parallel and adopting its phraseology; the only way of getting the newly converted serf population to church on Sundays was to forbid servile (i.e. rural) labour on such days. Cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, April 1935, pp. 273-5.

⁴ *Opus Theologicum Morale*, tr. VI, n. 3 (Prati, 1890), II, p. 516.

They have long ceased to do so. The advent of the machine, and, *a fortiori*, of automation, has substantially changed the social distribution of manual activities and introduced a clear distinction between those which people do because they have to, in the servitude of earning their livelihood, and those which they undertake as *liberi*, as and when they please. The former are still recognized as servile (though with an apologetic modern rider about the dignity of labour) and as liable to interfere with the sanctification of Sunday, if only because the time they occupy is not freely determined; the latter are considered to be liberal hobbies or pastimes, sometimes even deserving the name of "occupational therapy", and no more likely to interfere with the sanctification of Sunday than a moderate indulgence in games or, for that matter, mathematics.

Take, for example, the modern feminine addiction to knitting. Ever since machines shouldered the industrial burden, home-knitting has come to be regarded as a pastime for mistresses and maids, teachers and typists, "something for women to think about while they talk". To call it servile, classifying it with that rural labour which kept the serfs from church, is not only unrealistic, but liable to bring the law into ridicule. Since a law is by definition "an ordinance of reason", people rightly expect it to be patient of a reasonable interpretation, not merely in the light of ancient history, but in the light of contemporary social life.

Pending a revision of the law, designed to exclude all unnecessary secular pursuits inconsistent with Sunday's purpose, many theologians have sought to provide a more realistic interpretation of the term "servile" which lays the stress on the bondage rather than on the manual element of the work. Twenty-four years ago, in this REVIEW,¹ we suggested that manual hobbies, which are easily distinguishable from the kind of work which interferes with the sanctification of Sunday, should be removed altogether from the forbidden category. This suggestion, by no means original, is nowadays regularly supported in the periodicals² and has even attained the respec-

¹ June 1935, pp. 453-66.

² Cf. two excellent articles by P. Delhaye in *L'Ami du Clergé*, 10 April 1958, pp. 225-34, 17 April 1958, pp. 241-9; and Kelly, in *Theological Studies*, 1952, p. 90.

tability of inclusion in a standard manual.¹ We consider that it has now become solidly probable. To this extent, therefore, the modern attitude to work and exercise has, without abrogating the prohibition of servile work, modified its connotation. Nor need one fear that the sanctity of the Christian Sunday will thereby be impaired. The real danger now comes from the two extremes, unnecessary continuation of the weekday job and the exaggerated pursuit of worldly amusements.

PRE-MATRIMONIAL CONFESSION—WHOSE DUTY TO URGE IT?

When the parties to a marriage belong to different parishes and are to be married in that of the bride, it is common for the bride's parish priest to assume responsibility for the pre-nuptial inquiry in regard to both. Must he also undertake to exhort the groom to go to confession beforehand, or can he rightly and properly demand that the groom's parish priest shall remain responsible for this important and sometimes delicate duty? (Rural Dean.)

REPLY

Canon 1033: "Ne omittat parochus, secundum diversam personarum conditionem, sponsos docere sanctitatem sacramenti matrimonii, mutuas coniugum obligationes et obligationes parentum erga prolem; eosdemque vehementer adhortetur ut ante matrimonii celebrationem sua peccata diligenter confiteantur, et sanctissimam Eucharistiam pie recipient."

When the parties to a marriage belong to different parishes, the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that both are canonically free to marry falls on the parish priest who is to assist at the marriage. If, as will normally happen in virtue of canon 1097, §2, this is the parish priest of the bride, it is quite in order for him to conduct the main inquiry in regard to both.

¹ Noldin-Schmitt, *Summa Theol. Mor.* (1941 edition), II, n. 267. He distinguishes between gardening for a livelihood and gardening for fresh air and exercise, and sees no further reason for calling embroidery liberal and knitting servile.

In that case, his investigation must certainly cover the question of *public* sin on the part of either, because canon 1066 makes public sin an impedimental impediment, and *Sacrosanctum*, n. 5, expressly mentions it among the impediments on which he must interrogate the parties. With equal certainty, it does not cover *private* sin, because the Church, unable to take cognizance of such sin in her external forum, does not attempt to make it a canonical impediment. Since, however, the divine law forbids the parties to administer and receive the sacrament of matrimony in a state of mortal sin, canon 1033 prescribes that "the parish priest . . . must earnestly exhort them diligently to confess their sins and piously to receive the Holy Eucharist before the celebration of the marriage".

The placing of the canon, which immediately follows those dealing with the pre-nuptial inquiry, might seem to indicate that the Code requires the exhortation to be given by the parish priest who conducts the inquiry. But if, as we think more likely, it merely assumes that the parish priest of the inquiry will be the *parochus proprius* of both parties, and charges him, in this latter capacity, with the duty of delivering the exhortation to his own subjects, one cannot conclude that the same applies when, as in the case under discussion, one of the parties is not his subject. Indeed, there are good reasons to the contrary.

In the first place, the parish priest of the groom is not absolved of all responsibility by the mere fact that the parish priest of the bride has undertaken the principal responsibility for the marriage preliminaries. On the contrary, *Sacrosanctum*, n. 4 (a), expressly requires him to conduct a separate inquiry into the freedom of his own subject, "spontaneously, or at the request of the groom, or of the parish priest of the bride"; and though Canon Mahoney thought that the clergy could "await the direction of their own Ordinaries on this point",¹ it is certainly lawful for the bride's parish priest to call for a separate investigation and, if he does, the groom's parish priest must undertake it.² Even therefore if the exhortation is meant to be a supplement to the investigation, the groom's parish priest can legitimately be expected to supply it. But there is also the

¹ *Marriage Preliminaries*, n. 120.

² Cf. Mgr J. I. Johnson, in *The Jurist*, January 1955, p. 68.

further consideration that the exhortation is, of its nature, a pastoral duty arising from the care of souls, part of the spiritual preparation of the spouses, rather than an intrinsic element of the process of establishing their canonical freedom. We do not suggest that the bride's parish priest cannot therefore undertake it in regard to the groom, without trespass, for he is to be the official witness of the administration and reception of the sacrament by bride and groom alike; but, as a pastoral charge, it would seem to belong more fittingly to the proper pastor of each, and, at least when some awkwardness or difficulty is anticipated, can normally be best discharged by him. De Smet writes: "Et sane absque offensione excipient huiusmodi instructionem ex ore proprii pastoris";¹ and though he is dealing rather with the suitability of the proper pastor as against that of the confessor, the reason applies equally to the present case.

We conclude therefore that, even when the parish priest of the bride has undertaken the whole of the pre-nuptial investigation, properly so called, he can rightly require the parish priest of the groom to undertake the duty of exhorting the groom to prepare himself for the sacrament by a good Confession and Communion. We think, however, that the *ultimate* responsibility lies with the official witness to the celebration of the sacrament. If therefore the groom's parish priest refuses to undertake the duty of exhorting his own subject, the bride's parish priest must either supply the exhortation himself, or seek a ruling from the Ordinary.

FAST AND ABSTINENCE ON EVE OF ALL SAINTS

Now that the vigil of All Saints is no longer liturgically celebrated, does the eve of this feast remain a day of fasting and abstinence under the common law of canon 1252, §2? (J. P. O'C.)

REPLY

S.R.C. Decree, on the simplification of the rubrics, 23 March 1955, tit. II: "8. Vigiliae privilegiatae sunt: vigilia Nativitatis

¹ *De Sponsalibus et Matrimonio*, n. 695.

Domini et vigilia Pentecostes. 9. Vigiliae communes sunt: vigilia festorum Ascensionis Domini, Assumptionis B.M.V., S. Ioannis Baptiste, SS. Petri et Pauli, S. Laurentii. Omnes aliae vigiliae, etiam quae in calendariis particularibus sunt inscriptae, supprimuntur.”¹

The question will not be of practical moment in this country, for as long as our Ordinaries continue to use the general faculty granted by the Congregation of the Council, 28 January 1949, empowering them to dispense from the joint obligation of fasting with abstinence on all except four days in the year, of which exceptions this is not one;² but our correspondent writes from a country where this faculty to dispense is not used, and many other foreign readers are doubtless in the same case.

The suppression of the liturgical observance of the vigil of All Saints did not, of itself, necessarily entail the abrogation of the canonical obligation to fast and abstain on that day, because these two things are intrinsically distinct and separable, as indeed is evident from the recent transference to the eve of the Immaculate Conception of the fast and abstinence formerly required on the vigil of the Assumption.³ Moreover, it is not part of the normal competence of the Congregation of Rites to regulate the discipline of fasting and abstinence, and, though it could have been specially empowered by the Pope to abrogate this particular fast and abstinence along with the liturgical vigil of All Saints, it claimed no such power in the 1955 decree, and the relevant section, quoted above, speaks only of the suppression of the vigil.⁴ It was nevertheless assumed by some⁵ that the two things ceased together, and the Congregation of Rites itself confirmed this assumption in a private reply of 15 November 1956, to the Abbot of St Paul’s *in Urbe*, wherein it not merely declared that, with the suppression of the vigil, the obligation of the fast and abstinence was to be considered abrogated, but said that it did so, “utens facultatibus sibi a SS. D.N. Pio Papa XII tributis, auditio specialis commissionis liturgicae suffragio”. Publishing this text with a comment, the

¹ A.A.S., 1955, XLVII, p. 218; THE CLERGY REVIEW, June 1955, p. 356.

² A.A.S., 1949, XLI, p. 32; THE CLERGY REVIEW, April 1949, p. 279.

³ S.C. Conc., 25 July 1957; A.A.S., 1957, XLIX, p. 638.

⁴ Cf. Irish Ecclesiastical Record, January 1959, p. 57.

⁵ Including, e.g. H. Schmidt, s.j., in Periodica, 1955, p. 442.

*Ephemerides Liturgicae*¹ not unnaturally took it to mean that the Congregation of Rites had been specially authorized to deal with a disciplinary matter normally falling within the competence of the Congregation of the Council,² just as, in its decree of 16 November 1955, which restored the primitive Holy Week, it had been empowered to prolong the Lenten fast to the midnight of Holy Saturday. It would appear, however, that the Congregation of the Council does not, or did not, accept this interpretation of the faculty granted to the Congregation of Rites, because, in 1957, in response to an enquiry from the hierarchy of the U.S.A., it answered that the obligation to fast and abstain on the eve of All Saints remained in force.³

It is not for a private commentator to settle this conflict of authority. But the practical answer to our correspondent is that, in places where the common law is not dispensed, one should follow the ruling of the local Ordinary, who may prefer to settle the issue by using his power to dispense.

L. L. McR.

BOOK REVIEWS

Contemporary Moral Theology. By John C. Ford, s.j., and Gerald Kelly, s.j. Volume I. Pp. vii + 368. (Mercier Press, 1958. 30s.)

MORAL theology textbooks have come under heavy fire, in recent years, for clinging to what is said to be an arid, negative and outmoded approach to Christian moral doctrine, and there have even been efforts made to produce manuals with the "new look". The present work, of which this is the first volume, is not a textbook of either kind, traditional or revolutionary, but rather a supplement or companion to the manual of one's choice. The textbooks are normally years behind the periodicals in their treatment of new problems and current controversies, for the good reason that their authors or editors sensibly prefer to wait until the dust has settled, before committing themselves to an opinion in the relative finality of an edition; and even then their printer's stipulations may restrict them to a footnote. To keep abreast of contemporary ideas and opinions,

¹ 1957, f. 1, p. 54.

² Cf. canon 250.

³ Bouscaren-O'Connor, *Canon Law Digest*, IV, pp. 356-7.

therefore, one needs some other means of contact with what is being said in the periodicals, brochures and monographs of the day. As it happens, Frs Ford and Kelly were unusually well fitted to meet this need. For many years, in *Theological Studies*, they did a periodical round-up of current moral literature which showed that little escaped their notice, and it is in response to their many grateful readers that they have now attempted to do the same thing on a more ambitious scale and in more readily available form.

This first volume deals with contemporary questions affecting fundamental moral theology, most of which range around three basic topics of current controversy: the question of authority in moral doctrine; modern criticisms of the traditional approach and efforts to revise it, or, as in Situation Ethics, to replace it with a new moral system; and finally, the question of imputability in the light of modern psychology and psychiatry. Naturally enough, in view of the extensive moral teaching of the late Holy Father, we are given copious extracts from his relevant pronouncements; but the survey is not limited to orthodox doctrine and opinion; the many not-so-orthodox views aired in recent years are summarized and submitted to critical examination. Throughout, the authors give abundant evidence that their wide reading is matched by the soundness of their judgement. They are ready to accept and dispassionately evaluate all reasonable criticisms, and they take due account of contemporary conditions and modern discoveries in regard to the workings of the human mind and will. Indeed, to the present reviewer, their balanced and knowledgeable treatment of the whole problem of imputability, in the final part of the volume, provides an indirect but effective answer to many of the intemperate criticisms earlier considered. It meets what is reasonable in the objections, without departing from the common doctrine of the standard authors.

The present authors are aware of the difficulty intrinsic to a project of this kind, namely, that a survey of contemporary thought cannot long remain up to date, unless it is periodically re-done. Nevertheless, it was well worth doing, and this first stage has been excellently achieved. We look forward with eager anticipation to the next stages.

Universitates Studiorum in Ecclesiae Iure et in Concordatis Vigentibus. By Januarius Laudiero, J.C.D. Pp. 100. (D'Auria, Naples. Price not stated.)

THOUGH written in 1932, this doctoral dissertation has only recently been published, with a minor appendix to bring it up to date in the few points on which time has brought changes. Its theme, motivated

by *Deus Scientiarum Dominus*, is the rights of the Church in university education and the extent to which they are currently recognized by secular States. The first part examines, in complete and partly anticipated conformity with *Divini Illius Magistri*, the respective rights of the three necessary societies concerned with education, the family, the State and the Church, and shows how the Church, in addition to her divine commission to teach the truths of faith and morals, has a special natural competence to act for the parents in education generally. The author then shows how completely this claim is vindicated by the testimony of history, which reveals the primary responsibility of popes, bishops and Religious Orders for the founding and fostering of almost all the ancient universities and not a few of the new; so many are they, indeed, that he can seldom spare more than a paragraph to record each one of them. But few modern States recognize the rights of the Church as such, and therefore, in negotiating agreements with them, she has perforce to reduce her demands to the minimum obtainable. The second part of the work considers the rights which she is content to secure in existing concordats and the manner in which they are respected. It is inevitable that, with such a wide theme, the book should be somewhat sketchy; but it is well planned and clearly written.

The Matrimonial Impediment of Impotence: Occlusion of Spermatic Ducts and Vaginismus. By P. L. Frattin, J.C.L. Pp. x + 115. Canon Law Studies, n. 381. (The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C. \$2.00, paper-bound.)

THE topic of this dissertation is so hedged around with juridical hurdles that one cannot but admire the courage of a beginner bold enough to tackle it. It would be an exaggeration to say, however, that he has cleared the hurdles, or even that he has thrown fresh light on what was obscure. He is at his best in dealing with the problem of the *vagina posterius occlusa*, at his weakest in handling the controversy about double vasectomy. Throughout, his exposition suffers in clarity from the circumstance that the language in which he is writing is not native to him, and, in the physiological sections, it suffers from the fact that the terminology is native to no one.

Compendium Iuris Publici Ecclesiastici. By L. R. Sotillo, s.j. Enlarged third edition by E. F. Regatillo, s.j. Pp. 367. ("Sal Terrae", Santander, 1958. Price not stated.)

THERE are two approaches to the age-old problem of the juridical relationship of Church and State, which is the main, though not the only, topic of any treatise on the *iuris publicum* of the Church. One is

by way of the thesis, the other by way of the hypothesis. The former seeks to determine, on the basis of the divine natural and positive law, what ought to be the mutual relationship of these two perfect societies, irrespectively of whether it has ever been fully and successfully attained in the past, or is likely to be so attained in the present or future. The other begins from the premiss that, in the average civil society of today, if not also in those of the past, men do not, in fact, acknowledge the obligations imposed on them by the divine natural and positive law with anything like the unanimity necessary to give these obligations full and fruitful effect in the juridical relationship of Church and State, and endeavours to determine what is the best relationship which can prudently and usefully be set as a practical objective in the concrete situation. Both approaches are legitimate, provided that, in the latter case, one does not deny the principle that all men are objectively bound, individually and collectively, to embrace and practise the one divinely revealed religion in the one divinely constituted Church, and to have, as their ultimate goal, that harmonious co-operation of Church and State which the divine order intrinsically entails.

The present treatise proceeds firmly, and indeed with uncompromising rigidity, by way of the thesis. It admits, more or less *en passant*, that a State can be excused by "very grave causes" from giving public effect to its objective religious obligations, in order to avoid causing a greater evil or impeding a greater good, but devotes nine-tenths of its argument to stating, proving and vindicating the objective law, and drawing, with remorseless logic, all the detailed conclusions. To the Spaniard, who surveys the world scene in the light of the 1953 Concordat between his country and the Holy See, this may seem realistic enough, but to the great majority of Catholics it is likely to appear as an academic exercise, profitable indeed in establishing the indispensable basis of correct theory, but not very helpful in practice. The Maritains and Courtney Murrays whom the author regards as dangerous, and whose theories are admittedly not easily reconcilable with papal pronouncements on the subject, deserve credit at least for trying to elaborate a solution which is practicable in their nine-tenths of the world.

It may be owing to concentration on the thesis and reluctance to make concessions to the hypothesis that the author, or his editor, has misrepresented the teaching of Pius XII on toleration. The late Pope, in his address, *Ci riesce*, 6 December 1953, raised the question whether God could, in certain circumstances, refrain from granting to men any right to impede and repress error. He answered: "A glance at reality gives an affirmative answer. It shows that error and

sin are found in the world in ample measure. God reproves them, but allows them to exist. Hence, the affirmation: religious and moral deviation must always be impeded, when possible, because tolerance is in itself immoral—cannot be *absolutely and unconditionally valid*.¹ The book (p. 212) reproduces this part of the reply as follows: "Respondet Papa: Deus errorem et peccatum reprobat et tamen permittit; impediri debent semper, quantum fieri potest, *quia tolerantia est in se ipsa immorialis*" (author's italics). That the Pope did not concede the reason advanced in support of the affirmation to which he denied absolute validity, is clear from the fact that he went on to declare that, in certain circumstances toleration is not only permissible but preferable. It is to be hoped that this misreading is not based on an approved Spanish version.

The Provisions of the Decree "Spiritus Sancti Munera": The Law for the Extraordinary Minister of Confirmation. By Rev. H. J. Dziadosz, J.C.L. Pp. xii + 226.

Parochial Relations and Co-operation of the Religious and the Secular Clergy. By Rev. D. O'Connor, M.S.S.T., J.C.L. Pp. xiv + 196.

(The Catholic University of America Press. Canon Law Studies, nos. 397, 401. \$2.00 each, paper-bound.)

Both of these doctoral dissertations serve a useful purpose, alike from the historical and from the practical point of view. The author of the first does not pretend to give more than a summary of the history of the diverse practice of East and West in regard to the minister of Confirmation, but he gives enough to show that the theological difficulty involved is apparent rather than real. In his practical commentary he inevitably follows a well-trodden path, but it was worth doing, if only because, after ten years of discussion, the path can now be defined with a fair measure of certainty. One of his conclusions is that there is sufficient extrinsic authority for the view that the stop-gap administrator of canon 471, 2°, enjoys the faculty, but not the *vicarius substitutus* or *adiutor*. Apart from some spasms of introductory grandiloquence, he expounds his doctrine clearly and competently.

One of the historical causes of pastoral friction between secular and religious clerics was the fact that the latter, being comparatively

¹ "Uno sguardo alla realtà dà una risposta affermativa. Essa mostra che l'errore e il peccato si trovano nel mondo in ampia misura. Dio li riprova; eppure li lascia esistere. Quindi l'affermazione: il travamento religioso e morale deve essere sempre impedito, quando è possibile, perché la sua tolleranza è in sé stessa immorale—non può valere nella sua incondizionata assoluzza" (A.A.S., 1953, XLV, p. 799).

late-comers in the field of the active apostolate, were resented as intruders, the more so because they remained outside the existing organization by exemption and other privileges. Fr O'Connor's dissertation begins by tracing the evolution of the canonical discipline which eventually established the right of religious clerics to an integral and normal part of this field, and harmonized its practical exercise with the diocesan and parochial system. This is followed by a canonical commentary which shows in clear and scholarly fashion that the current discipline forestalls all legitimate grievances and points of friction. All that is required to make it work is a fraternal charity which takes to heart the lesson of the parable about the workers summoned to the vineyard. Today, we learn, "fifty-two per cent of the priests in the Church are also members of religious institutes"; and "neither of the two special forms of clerical life holds any prerogative of divine right nor has precedence over the other".

The Family Clinic. A Book of Questions and Answers. By J. L. Thomas, s.j. Pp. ix + 336. (The Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland. 1958. \$3.95.)

CONTRARY to what one might gather from the main title, this book has nothing to do with the kind of clinic which seeks to "plan" families, usually by illicit means. It is itself a clinic in print, to which family troubles can be brought for solution or guidance. The author is a member of the Institute of Social Order and the Department of Sociology at St Louis University, and has acquired a wide experience of case-histories by dealing, in a weekly column carried by some forty Catholic newspapers, with the problems sent in by their readers. The eighty-three questions and answers here contained originally appeared in that column, and have been selected for publication in book form because of their general applicability and interest. They cover the mutual relationships, theological, psychological and practical, of husbands and wives, parents and children, courting couples, and of the family to society; and they range from *My Husband Could Earn More if He Just Had More Drive*, and *Is There Any Cure for Women Who Have to Nag All the Time?* to *How Can Parents Best Give Their Children Sex Instruction?* and *How Should Husbands and Wives Divide Authority in the Home?* Naturally enough the questions and answers alike assume the American background, even if not always as evidently as in *Should High School Seniors Own Second-Hand Cars?* but most of the problems are common to our English way of life, and they are handled with a homely good sense and factual knowledge which should be helpful anywhere. The

book is handsomely produced and should prove a welcome addition to the shelves of a parish library or marriage advisory bureau.

L. L. McR.

Our Children and Ourselves. By Etienne de Greeff. Translated from the French by the Earl of Wicklow. With an Introduction by Rev. E. F. O'Doherty, M.A., D.PH. Pp. 151. (Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds. 16s.)

THAT this book should be sponsored by an introduction from the very competent pen of the Professor of Logic and Psychology at University College, Dublin, gives it a cachet of sound scholarship and orthodoxy. Dr de Greeff pursues the individual from birth (and before) till he is well launched in his adult life with a psychological analysis that is bewildering at times in its minuteness and completeness. The work is a masterly exposition of family psychology as well as of the psychic dynamism of the growing individual. As Dr O'Doherty says: "Dr de Greeff defends the family as a necessary and natural institution, not only on philosophical and theological grounds, but also on the basis of empirical evidence as psychology reveals it in the personality of the child."

Yet one cannot deny that Dr de Greeff's book is hard reading. This is not due, at least not entirely, to his statements being packed so closely on top of one another that we feel that we are continuously under a kind of verbal machine-gun fire. The difficulty seems rather to be that the work has the aura of a French rather than of an English book. This is not the fault of the translation which is in excellent English: it is rather a matter of the author's personal style which must persist even in translation. Yet we would much regret it if these remarks prevented anyone from reading the book. For, taken slowly, it repays study. There is much wisdom and matter for meditation in every paragraph. That is so even if we do not commit ourselves to agreement with all that the author says.

Guide for Religious Administrators. By Paul Hoffer, s.m. Translated by Gabriel J. Rus, s.m. Pp. vi + 171. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. \$4.50.)

THIS book is from the pen of the Superior General of the Society of Mary. It was intended solely for the members of his own Society and was only made available for general sale at the request of some other Congregations engaged in similar work. The work is therefore addressed to Superiors of teaching Congregations and much of it envisages a life spent in teaching as a background to the advice

which the author gives. None of the routine of community or teaching duties is neglected. The writer has, however, had his own Congregation and its particular vocation very much in mind and so not a little of what he says scarcely finds an application in Orders which have not got such a particularized purpose. But nowadays there are so many Congregations which are engaged exclusively in the important work of teaching and training youth that there will be large numbers, outside the author's own Congregation, for whom the book might have been specially written.

The writer does not make pretence of scaling any great ascetical heights or plumbing psychological depths. He keeps to very practical routine detail. He reserves the ascetical element for the last chapter, "Meditations for a Superior", and there we find some very shrewd reminders of some of the Superior's fundamental duties as, e.g. "He is expected to encourage others even when he himself is discouraged" (p. 161). It seems unfortunate that the title should use the word "Administrators" when clearly Superiors are meant: indeed the heading of the first chapter is "The Superior is an Administrator". The other chapters are "The Superior is the Father of His Community", "The Superior is Head of the School", "The Superior is Responsible for the Material Welfare of the Community" and "Meditations for a Superior".

We have not seen the original but the translation seems to be well done, though we do occasionally encounter a sentence which scarcely seems to make sense in English. There are very few instances of words used with a meaning which is either unfamiliar to us or definitely wrong. One such is "editors" for "publishers" on page 110. We think that the book will serve well for those to whom it is addressed as a useful detailed reminder of their duties to their communities and their schools: a kind of manual of examination of conscience.

A. BONNAR, O.F.M.

Apostolic Life. Pp. vii + 206. (Blackfriars Publications. 21s.)

AMONG the original daughters of the Visitation St Jane Frances had only two who could read. Perhaps that was exceptional even for those days. Today it would be unthinkable. The problem with religious sisters today is not literacy, but adaptability to the conditions of the age. The various aspects of this problem have been considered at annual conferences held in Paris since the Second World War. The outcome is a valuable series of publications embodying the papers read, of which the present volume is the tenth. The first of the series, *Religious Sisters*, made a general survey,

historical and actual, of the religious life; those following have dealt with specific questions: vocation, the vows, the instruction and direction of sisters, the communal life, and the functions of the mistress of novices. Although the conferences had directly in view the problems of the French sisterhoods, nevertheless a great deal of the material was of general application, and we owe gratitude to the various translators and to the publishers for making the successive conferences available in English.

Apostolic Life is set out in three parts. The first explains the notion of "mission" as given in Sacred Scripture, traces the varying usage of the word "apostle" in ancient, mediaeval and modern times, and analyses the character of the apostle as the New Testament presents it. The second part deals historically and canonically with the apostolate as exercised by religious. The attitude of the Eastern Church is first considered; in the ancient Church in Persia and in certain modern institutes there was a monastic apostolate; but on the whole the stress in the East has been laid on contemplation rather than action. In the West, as the second paper shows, the ancient orders of women were contemplative; but in the Middle Ages to some extent, and more notably in recent centuries, active institutes have been established and encouraged alongside the contemplatives. The juridical character of these active congregations and the nature and scope of the Church's mandate issued to them are considered canonically in the third paper.

The third part studies the relation between the active apostolate and the spiritual life of the religious. The first paper establishes the necessity, for a true apostolate, of an interior life of prayer and sacrifice. But, as the author says, the requirements of the apostolate will make it difficult, and sometimes almost impossible, for some to resort to these means of prayer and sacrifice as frequently as they would wish. "The task is there—souls are harassing and consuming them, as they did the Curé d'Arts, who was indeed a victim of the confessional all his life, and all his life wanted to go and shut himself up in la Trappe to pray."

The following writer faces this problem squarely. He rejects the view, held, it seems, by the Cistercian Dom Chautard that "activity is a danger and in no way a means of grace and union with God", that it can and ought to be sanctified, but is not sanctifying. On the contrary, it can be sanctifying and it is a means of grace, provided one turns it into virtual prayer and accepts as the will of God the sacrifices it entails. In this way it is made one with the rest of one's life of prayer and sacrifice. This is, as the writer shows, the genuine

teaching of St Thomas. It is a consoling doctrine, not only for religious, but also, and perhaps even more so, for the pastoral clergy, immersed today in so many calls and cares.

The third paper in this section deals with community life and its importance for the apostolate. By her profession the religious gives herself to the community, and by her vows, particularly obedience, surrenders and dedicates herself to the needs of those her community serves. The two final papers have a practical bearing. The religious must keep to her essential life. At the same time the demands of the apostolate are exigent, and they are changing. Can the religious teacher or nurse measure up to the standards required today in her profession without being overdriven? Can lay apostles fit in if they join a religious institute, or will they not find a constant tension between their old life and the new? Or seem to be squandering their living strength? How shall a religious acquire the necessary mobility to do her work efficiently in a religious institute whose rules and constitutions derive from a past generation? And so on. The writers insist on the preservation of the essential religious life; but adaptation there must be. As the closing writer, the only nun contributor, says:

We must know our Founder. We must know the Divine inspiration which was his, and which was crystallized in the Rules. Each generation must discover his spirit afresh and make it live again . . . that is fidelity. That is why it can be said that many Religious have preserved their standard of perfection by adapting it.

Like all its predecessors, this is emphatically a very good book, not only to be read but inwardly digested.

The Life of St John of the Cross. By Crisólogo de Jesús, O.C.D. Translated by Kathleen Pond. Pp. xvi + 400. (Longmans. 45s.)

THE late Allison Peers published the first edition of his translation of the *Works of St John of the Cross* in 1933, and the second in 1951. The two dates roughly cover the period between Père Bruno's Life of St John and this new one by Padre Crisólogo. Both are excellent; but in the interval between them there has been such intense research into new material connected with the Saint that in certain details Père Bruno must be considered out of date; Professor Peers did in fact, in the light of this fresh material, recast for his second edition the outline Life of St John which he prefixed to his translation.

Padre Crisogono is one of the most eminent modern Spanish Carmelites. Along with Padre Silverio he has penetrated very deeply into the mind of St John of the Cross and given himself unweariedly to the quest for fresh information that would throw light on the Saint and his teaching. It was therefore a grievous loss to scholarship when he died prematurely at the age of forty-one as the result of an unfortunate medical injection.

The qualities of this biography are critical accuracy in detail, a clear and colourful backcloth of the Spanish scene, and a well-rounded, living portrait of St John. The Saint's life, for all his high mysticism, was so full of action and human drama—he was a vital four feet ten, Spanish to the core in his intensity—that it could hardly fail of interest even at the hands of a pedestrian biographer. As Padre Crisogono tells it, it comes over with its full impact. While one must be wary, in view of the constant research that goes on, of claiming any Life of St John as definitive, it can at least be said that this one will be the standard biography for a considerable time. Miss Pond's translation is a delight to read.

A map and sixteen pages of illustrations are incorporated in the text. The translator relegates to the end of the volume the copious notes and references and the notes on the manuscripts used; they cover nearly seventy-five pages. For those who do not want this documentation, the publishers have issued a cheaper edition of the Life, containing only the text, map and index, price 18s.

J. C.

The Edwardine Ordinal. By Fr C. Hoare. (To be obtained from the author, at 25 Upper Maze Hill, St Leonards, Sussex. 17s. 6d. net.)

FR HOARE's little book on *Continuity* has often been used by busy priests who have to instruct the historically minded enquirer, and this expanded and modernized version of it will be widely appreciated. The present reviewer is perhaps not impartial, for he finds that some of his own material has been incorporated here and there, but it does really appear that Fr Hoare has covered the whole matter of the *Ordinal*, its origin, its treatment by Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole, by Bonner later and by the authorities at Douai and Rome, and its subsequent history down to the South India scheme of 1955 inclusive. Its ambiguities of wording are made quite clear. Only one omission can be noticed: that some Edwardine bishops did not venture to use it, for Chester and Durham held no ordinations during the years 1550–53, as their records show. At a time when the Apostolic Succession is being so warmly discussed by

Anglicans and Nonconformists these pages are more useful than ever.

Genesi del Pensiero Cristiano. By Fr Ceslao Pera, o.p. (Ars graphica Presbyterium, Rome. 400 lire.)

THIS work has all the appearance of a note-book that someone has prepared for an examination. The typography is so varied that continuous reading is difficult and the matter is set out in a summary way that will not be very helpful save to one who has made the summary for himself or had it expounded to him in lectures. There are desultory notes on the creed, on Clement I, Justin, the pseudo-Denis and other worthies. What is said about Gnosticism is out of date, and there is nothing about Melito's homily on the Passion.

The Papacy. By Wladimir d'Ormesson. Translated by Michael Derrick. (Burns & Oates. 7s. 6d.)

THIS is a version of *La Papauté* in the series *Je sais*; the translator has provided a page of English bibliography, but otherwise the adaptation is not extensive. Cullmann was used in the French original for much of the argument about the primacy of Peter, but the answer to Cullmann's objection that James succeeded to Peter's position could and should have been made more effective for an English work. In the brief history of the papacy that is given one could well have spared the space that is given up to citing what *Le Temps* and *L'Humanité* said about the death of Pius X in order to have something about what Grosseteste and Cardinal Pole, or SS. Patrick and Columbanus thought about the papacy. The list of popes printed as an appendix is the revised one from the *Annuario* of post-war days, but Sylvester III, Gregory VI and Clement II appear as lawful popes, whereas Cardinal Mercati, in his important commentary on this list (in *Medieval Studies*, 1947), argued that, if the removals of Benedict IX were unlawful, and that must be regarded as certain the first time, then Sylvester, Gregory and Clement were anti-popes.

J. H. CREHAN, s.j.

The Twenty Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church. By Fr Clement Raab, o.f.m. (The Newman Press, Maryland. \$3.50.)

THE interest everywhere aroused by the Holy Father's announcement of an Ecumenical Council to be held in Rome in 1960 or 1961 has prompted the alert Newman Press to re-issue this very useful little book which was first published in 1937. It is a model of all that is succinct and practical, arranged upon a clear, methodical

and almost mechanical plan which ensures uniformity of treatment by the author and almost invites memorization by the reader. The chapter for each council is divided into two parts: "Work of the Council" and "Proceedings of the Council", the latter with separate paragraphs for the summaries of each session's results. In five instances the essence of the dogmatical decision is quoted in Greek (with translation) and in seven later instances in Latin. The general text is preceded by a Synopsis in which the basic facts of each council is tabulated thus:

Sixteenth Ecumenical Council.

Page 120

<i>Place:</i>	Constance.
<i>Time:</i>	1414.
<i>Pope:</i>	{ Gregory XII, 1406-1417. Martin V, 1417-1431.
<i>Emperor:</i>	Sigismund, 1410-1437.
<i>Work of the Council:</i>	(1) Removal of the papal schism. (2) Extirpation of heresy. (3) General reformation of the Church in "Head and members".

It is evident, therefore, that the work is intended as a kind of Ready Reckoner, designed for quick reference and (probably) for immediate quotation. There is a maximum of fact and a minimum of comment and great ingenuity, as well as learning, has gone to the packing of so much information into so few pages. Indeed it is made very clear that the seminarians and students who "have neither time nor the opportunity to delve into and analyse sources and controversies" will be deemed to be sufficiently informed by what is here given them. Fr Plassmann, O.F.M., in a Foreword, compares the history of the Church to a river in which "the twenty councils stand out as so many waterfalls . . . where the river gathers new force and speed for its onward journey"; he might also compare them to locks which ensure safe and uninterrupted navigation.

Under the treatment adopted most of the Councils are made to appear as plain sailing. Basel-Ferrara-Florence (1431-42) however gives the author work for twenty pages, especially because of the Union Council from 1438-42. The schismatical prolongation at Basel, up to 1449, "the Long Parliament of the Church", which declared Eugenius IV "pertinacious", "deposed" him and elected an anti-pope, is here curtly dismissed in five lines.

Trent inevitably gets the longest chapter, thirty-one pages, and the author has had enough to do to compress into that space the doctrinal definitions and the disciplinary decrees without attempting

to expiate on the obstructive attitude of the Emperor Charles V, who pursued a mirage of compromise and conciliation, on the schismatical tendencies of the French, or on the Byzantinism of Philip II of Spain. A just tribute is, however, paid to the energy and perseverance of Paul III without which there would have been no council; in that matter he was not "*vas dilatioris*". For the Vatican Council Fr Raab draws attention to the size and weight of the opposition on the question of the Infallibility, and names the leaders of the minority.

The volume is neatly produced and well printed. There are only two unimportant misprints—and the famous W. G. Ward was not a Monsignor.

J. J. DWYER

I Had Itching Ears. By Elinor D. Rhodes. Pp. 54. (Clonmore & Reynolds. Paper 3s.)

THE new conversion story of an Anglican, who found, as so many do, that she was always being asked "What made you become a Catholic?" Also, like so many, she offers the little book directly to our Lady, who is seen from outside as such a barrier to Faith. Each new story may well help another to the Church. This is truly compact and easily slipped in the pocket.

The Carrying of the Cross. By Sister Mary Jean Dorcy, o.p. (St Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N.J. \$2.00.)

SISTER DORCY has set out to meditate upon the way of the cross in her own life. From this springs a series of chapters on the Stations, each of three or four prayers, along with a woodcut meditation by the author. Her purpose is to give food for thought, especially for women; who were so faithful on The Way and at Calvary, and who remain so faithful today.

The most noteworthy and unusual part is perhaps the short Nurse's Stations at the end of the book. A useful idea for a priest working in hospital to put across to Nurses' Guild and so on.

M. H.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

V,
the
of
nd
no
an
he
ers

ly
ot

&

ny
e a
to
ch
uly

(St

in
ns,
by
for
and

short

iest

d for
x, in